

HISTORY  
OF EUROPE  
OUR OWN TIMES



ROBINSON AND BEARD

NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE




TRENT UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY











Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation



GENEVA, THE SEAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS



# HISTORY OF EUROPE

## OUR OWN TIMES

THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES  
THE OPENING OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY  
THE WORLD WAR, AND RECENT EVENTS

BY

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON

AND

CHARLES A. BEARD

*REVISED EDITION*



GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON • NEW YORK • CHICAGO • LONDON  
ATLANTA • DALLAS • COLUMBUS • SAN FRANCISCO

3299      K6      1059

COPYRIGHT, 1927, BY JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON  
AND CHARLES A. BEARD  
ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

929.2

**The Athenæum Press**  
GINN AND COMPANY · PRO-  
PRIETORS · BOSTON · U.S.A.



## PREFACE

In preparing this edition we have gone carefully over the text in the interest of simplification and have eliminated many words and phrases deemed too abstract for pupils of the high-school age. Our primary purpose, however, has been to bring the story of our own times up to date by adding chapters on the development of world affairs since the close of the World War in 1918. The new historical materials on the origins of that war have been surveyed and many modifications made in the text on the basis of the best evidence now available. To assist the teacher in the search for a truer perspective on the events of recent years, the bibliographical note at the close of the volume has been recast to include several of the latest and most important works likely to be found in libraries of a modest compass. Bearing in mind the facilities for research and the time at the disposal of pupils for whom this volume is primarily designed, we have refrained from overburdening our pages with references to technical works. We suggest that the teachers who have the privilege of extending the range of their students' reading make use of one or more high-grade encyclopedias, particularly for biographies and special topics. The articles in the standard encyclopedias are usually written by competent authorities and are in general as reliable as the historical works to which students have access. Moreover, it is very desirable for high-school pupils to acquire the habit of constant reference to encyclopedias for additional information and guidance in advanced studies.

C. A. B.  
J. H. R.





# CONTENTS

## *BOOK I. INTRODUCTORY REVIEW OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*

| CHAPTER  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. AGE OF LOUIS XIV AND THE CONTEST OVER SPAIN                                 |      |
| I. Clues to Modern European History . . . . .                                  | 1    |
| II. Louis XIV and Absolute Monarchy . . . . .                                  | 4    |
| III. How Louis encouraged Art and Literature . . . . .                         | 8    |
| IV. Louis XIV attacks his Neighbors . . . . .                                  | 10   |
| V. Louis XIV and his Protestant Subjects . . . . .                             | 12   |
| VI. War of the Spanish Succession . . . . .                                    | 13   |
| II. RUSSIA AND PRUSSIA BECOME EUROPEAN POWERS                                  |      |
| I. Beginnings of Russia . . . . .  | 17   |
| II. Peter the Great . . . . .  | 19   |
| III. Origin of the Kingdom of Prussia . . . . .                                | 22   |
| IV. The Wars of Frederick the Great . . . . .                                  | 26   |
| V. Three Partitions of Poland, 1772, 1793, and 1795 . . . . .                  | 29   |
| VI. The Austrian Realms: Maria Theresa and Joseph II . . . . .                 | 33   |
| III. THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN INDIA AND NORTH AMERICA        |      |
| I. How Europe began to extend its Commerce over the Whole World . . . . .      | 37   |
| II. Contest between England and France for Colonial Empire: India . . . . .    | 39   |
| III. Revolt of the American Colonies from England . . . . .                    | 44   |
| <br><i>BOOK II. CONDITIONS AND REFORMS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY</i>           |      |
| IV. LIFE OF THE PEOPLE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: NOBILITY AND CLERGY          |      |
| I. Life in the Country — Serfdom . . . . .                                     | 51   |
| II. The Towns and the Guilds . . . . .   | 54   |
| III. The Nobility and the Monarchy . . . . .                                   | 58   |
| IV. The Catholic Church . . . . .  | 62   |
| V. The English Established Church and the Protestant Sects . . . . .           | 65   |
| V. THE SPIRIT OF REFORM  |      |
| I. The Development of Modern Science . . . . .                                 | 70   |
| II. How the Scientific Discoveries produced a Tendency toward Reform . . . . . | 74   |
| III. New Ideas of Government and its Functions . . . . .                       | 80   |

| CHAPTER  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| VI. BEGINNINGS OF REFORM BEFORE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION  |      |
| I. Reforms of Frederick II, Catherine II, and Joseph II . . . . .                              | 88   |
| II. England after the Revolution of 1688 . . . . .   | 93   |
| III. The English Limited Monarchy in the Eighteenth Century<br>and George III . . . . .        | 95   |
| <br><i>BOOK III. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND NAPOLEON</i><br>                                    |      |
| VII. THE EVE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION  |      |
| I. Confusion of the Old Régime . . . . .   | 101  |
| II. The Privileged Classes: the Third Estate . . . . .   | 104  |
| III. Powers of the French King: the Parlements . . . . .                                       | 109  |
| IV. How Louis XVI tried to play the Benevolent Despot . . . . .                                | 112  |
| VIII. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION  |      |
| I. How the Estates were summoned in 1789 . . . . .   | 118  |
| II. First Reforms of the National Assembly, July to October,<br>1789 . . . . .                 | 125  |
| III. The National Assembly in Paris, October, 1789, to Septem-<br>ber, 1791 . . . . .          | 129  |
| IV. France becomes involved in a War with Other European<br>Powers . . . . .                   | 133  |
| V. Founding of the First French Republic . . . . .   | 139  |
| VI. The Reign of Terror . . . . .  | 142  |
| VII. End of the Reign of Terror: the Directory . . . . .                                       | 147  |
| IX. EUROPE AND NAPOLEON  |      |
| I. General Bonaparte . . . . .   | 152  |
| II. How Bonaparte made himself Master of France . . . . .                                      | 157  |
| III. How Bonaparte secured Peace in 1801 and reorganized<br>Germany . . . . .                  | 161  |
| IV. Bonaparte restores Order and Prosperity in France . . . . .                                | 165  |
| V. How Napoleon destroyed the Holy Roman Empire . . . . .                                      | 167  |
| VI. Napoleon humiliates Prussia: the Continental Blockade . . . . .                            | 171  |
| VII. Napoleon at the Zenith of his Power (1808-1812) . . . . .                                 | 176  |
| VIII. The Fall of Napoleon . . . . .   | 183  |
| <br><i>BOOK IV. FROM THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA TO THE<br/>FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR (1815-1870)</i><br> |      |
| X. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE AT THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA                                      |      |
| I. The Congress of Vienna and its Work . . . . .   | 193  |
| II. Results of the Revolutionary Period: Nationalism . . . . .                                 | 198  |
| III. The Holy Alliance: Metternich becomes the Chief Oppo-<br>nent of Revolution . . . . .     | 202  |
| IV. Thought and Culture at the Opening of the Nineteenth<br>Century . . . . .                  | 205  |

# Contents

vii

| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| XI. REACTION AND REVOLUTION AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA                        |      |
| I. The Restoration of the Bourbons in France . . . . .                          | 210  |
| II. The Revolution of 1830 . . . . .  | 212  |
| III. Establishment of the Kingdom of Belgium . . . . .                          | 215  |
| IV. Formation of the German Confederation . . . . .                             | 217  |
| V. Restoration in Spain and Italy . . . . .                                     | 221  |
| VI. The Spanish-American Colonies and the Revolution of 1820                    | 223  |
| XII. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION  |      |
| I. Invention of Machinery for Spinning and Weaving . . . . .                    | 230  |
| II. The Steam Engine . . . . .  | 234  |
| III. Capitalism and the Factory System . . . . .                                | 237  |
| IV. Effects of the New Business Methods . . . . .                               | 240  |
| V. The Rise of Socialism . . . . .  | 243  |
| XIII. REVOLUTION OF 1848 IN FRANCE  |      |
| I. Unpopularity of Louis Philippe's Government . . . . .                        | 248  |
| II. The Second French Republic . . . . .  | 251  |
| III. Louis Napoleon and the Second French Empire . . . . .                      | 256  |
| XIV. REVOLUTION OF 1848 — AUSTRIA, GERMANY, ITALY                               |      |
| I. The Fall of Metternich . . . . .   | 260  |
| II. Uprisings in Central Europe . . . . .                                       | 265  |
| III. General Failure of the Revolutions of 1848 . . . . .                       | 268  |
| XV. THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY  |      |
| I. Plans for Uniting Italy . . . . .  | 273  |
| II. Rôle of Napoleon III in Italy . . . . .                                     | 276  |
| III. The Kingdom of Italy since 1861 . . . . .                                  | 279  |
| XVI. FORMATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE AND THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN UNION              |      |
| I. Prussia assumes the Leadership in Germany . . . . .                          | 288  |
| II. The War of 1866 and the Formation of the North German Federation . . . . .  | 293  |
| III. The Franco-Prussian War and the Foundation of the German Empire . . . . .  | 295  |
| IV. Austria-Hungary after 1866 . . . . .  | 301  |
| <br><i>BOOK V. REFORM IN EUROPE BEFORE THE WORLD WAR</i>                        |      |
| XVII. THE GERMAN EMPIRE (1871-1918)   |      |
| I. The German Constitution . . . . .  | 307  |
| II. Bismarck and State Socialism . . . . .                                      | 314  |
| III. Germany's Policy of Protection and Colonization; Foreign Affairs . . . . . | 317  |
| IV. Reign of William II . . . . .   | 320  |

| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| <b>XVIII. FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC</b>   |      |
| I. The Paris Commune and the Question of Restoring Monarchy . . . . .                                   | 324  |
| II. Establishment of the Third Republic and its Constitution . . . . .                                  | 329  |
| III. The Separation of Church and State . . . . .   | 332  |
| IV. Political Parties in France: the Socialists . . . . .   | 337  |
| V. Expansion of France . . . . .  | 339  |
| <b>XIX. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL REFORMS IN ENGLAND</b>   |      |
| I. Extension of the Right to Vote . . . . .   | 344  |
| II. The English Cabinet . . . . .   | 354  |
| III. Freedom of Speech and Opinion, and Reform of the Criminal Law . . . . .                            | 357  |
| IV. Social Reforms . . . . .  | 361  |
| V. Free Trade . . . . .   | 365  |
| VI. The Irish Question . . . . .  | 367  |
| <b>BOOK VI. MERGING OF EUROPEAN HISTORY INTO WORLD HISTORY</b>  |      |
| <b>XX. THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE AND THE SPREAD OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION</b>                               |      |
| I. How the Peoples of the Globe have been brought together by Improved Means of Communication . . . . . | 375  |
| II. Trade Competition; Imperialism; Rôle of the Missionaries . . . . .                                  | 380  |
| <b>XXI. THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY</b>  |      |
| I. The Extension of British Dominion in India . . . . .   | 384  |
| II. The Dominion of Canada . . . . .  | 390  |
| III. The Australasian Colonies . . . . .  | 394  |
| IV. Growth of the British Empire in Africa . . . . .  | 397  |
| <b>XXII. THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY</b>   |      |
| I. The Reigns of Alexander I (1801-1825) and Nicholas I (1825-1855) . . . . .                           | 406  |
| II. The Freeing of the Serfs and the Growth of the Spirit of Revolution . . . . .                       | 410  |
| III. The Industrial Revolution in Russia . . . . .  | 416  |
| IV. The Struggle for Liberty under Nicholas II . . . . .  | 418  |
| <b>XXIII. TURKEY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION</b>   |      |
| I. The Greek War of Independence . . . . .  | 428  |
| II. The Crimean War (1854-1856) . . . . .   | 431  |
| III. Revolts in the Balkan Peninsula . . . . .  | 433  |

| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| <b>XXIV. EUROPEAN INTERESTS IN THE FAR EAST</b>   |      |
| I. Relations of Europe with China . . . . .   | 437  |
| II. Japan becomes a World Power; Intervention in China . .                                    | 439  |
| III. War between Japan and China and its Consequences for<br>Europe . . . . .                 | 445  |
| IV. Changes in China; the Boxer Rising . . . . .  | 448  |
| V. The Russo-Japanese War; the Revolution in China . . .                                      | 451  |
| <br><b>XXV. EXPLORATION AND PARTITION OF AFRICA; LATIN AMERICA</b>                            |      |
| I. Gradual Exploration of Africa by Europeans . . . . .                                       | 455  |
| II. Partition of Africa . . . . .   | 458  |
| III. Question of Morocco and Egypt . . . . .  | 460  |
| IV. Decline of the Spanish Empire and Rise of the United<br>States as a World Power . . . . . | 464  |
| <br><b>BOOK VII. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY AND THE WORLD WAR</b>                                  |      |
| <b>XXVI. EUROPE IN THE OPENING YEARS OF THE TWENTIETH<br/>CENTURY</b>                         |      |
| I. Review of the Previous Chapters . . . . .  | 469  |
| II. War on Poverty in England, 1906-1914 . . . . .  | 471  |
| III. Curbing of the House of Lords; Suffrage; the Irish<br>Question . . . . .                 | 479  |
| IV. Germany as a World Power . . . . .  | 485  |
| V. France in the Twentieth Century . . . . .  | 492  |
| VI. The Socialistic Movement . . . . .  | 496  |
| <br><b>XXVII. PROGRESS OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE AND INVENTION</b>                                  |      |
| I. The Great Age of the Earth; Development of Living<br>Things . . . . .                      | 500  |
| II. Discoveries in the Treatment of Disease . . . . .   | 502  |
| III. Discovery of the Nature of Matter . . . . .  | 506  |
| IV. How the Chemists can now create Substances Old and New                                    | 509  |
| V. Effects of Gasoline and Electricity on Our Lives . . . . .                                 | 510  |
| VI. The New History . . . . .   | 512  |
| VII. The Age of Reading; Democratization of Knowledge . . .                                   | 514  |
| <br><b>XXVIII. ORIGIN OF THE WORLD WAR</b>  |      |
| I. The Armies and Navies of Europe . . . . .  | 518  |
| II. Failure of the Peace Movement to check Armaments . . .                                    | 522  |
| III. International Rivalries and Combinations . . . . .                                       | 526  |
| IV. The Near-Eastern Question . . . . .   | 532  |
| V. Extinction of Turkey in Europe . . . . .   | 533  |
| VI. Outbreak of the War . . . . .   | 540  |



| CHAPTER  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| XXIX. FIRST YEARS OF THE WORLD WAR (1914-1916)                                     |      |
| I. Course of the War in 1914 and 1915 . . . . .                                    | 546  |
| II. The War on the Sea . . . . .   | 553  |
| III. The Campaigns of 1916 . . . . .   | 555  |
| IV. The United States and the World War . . . . .                                  | 559  |
| XXX. FINAL STAGES OF THE WAR; THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION                               |      |
| I. Entrance of the United States into the War . . . . .                            | 563  |
| II. The World at War . . . . .   | 565  |
| III. The Russian Revolution; the Bolsheviki . . . . .                              | 568  |
| IV. Issues of the War . . . . .  | 571  |
| V. Course of the War after the Entrance of the United States . . . . .             | 579  |
| VI. Fall of the Hohenzollern and Hapsburg Dynasties and Close of the War . . . . . | 584  |
| XXXI. THE PEACE OF VERSAILLES AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS                            |      |
| I. The Peace Conference . . . . .  | 589  |
| II. The New Map of Europe . . . . .  | 591  |
| III. Special Terms Imposed on Germany . . . . .                                    | 596  |
| IV. The League of Nations . . . . .  | 597  |
| XXXII. EUROPE'S SEARCH FOR PEACE AND PROSPERITY                                    |      |
| I. Plight of Europe in 1918 . . . . .  | 600  |
| II. General Features of the New Constitutions . . . . .                            | 605  |
| III. Radical Character of the German and Russian Constitutions . . . . .           | 608  |
| IV. The Swing to Conservatism in Northern Europe . . . . .                         | 612  |
| V. Fascism: the Conservative Reaction in Italy . . . . .                           | 614  |
| VI. Great Britain and her Self-governing Empire . . . . .                          | 618  |
| VII. Readjustments in Southeastern Europe . . . . .                                | 623  |
| XXXIII. READJUSTING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  |      |
| I. The Question of German Reparations . . . . .                                    | 630  |
| II. The Question of European Security . . . . .                                    | 632  |
| III. Development of the League of Nations . . . . .                                | 635  |
| IV. What of the Future in Europe? . . . . .  | 640  |
| V. Relations of the United States with Europe . . . . .                            | 642  |
| VI. Europe and the Orient . . . . .  | 646  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .   | i    |
| INDEX . . . . .  | ix   |

## LIST OF COLORED PLATES

| PLATE I  | PAGE         |
|--|--------------|
| GENEVA — THE SEAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS . . .   | Frontispiece |
| <b>PLATE II</b>  |              |
| A FIGHT IN THE BRITISH CHANNEL BETWEEN THE OLD-<br>FASHIONED WOODEN MEN-OF-WAR OF THE ENGLISH AND THE<br>DUTCH . . . . . | 38           |
| <b>PLATE III</b>   |              |
| A STREET SCENE IN CANNES IN SOUTHERN FRANCE . . . . .  | 106          |
| <b>PLATE IV</b>  |              |
| OPENING OF THE OPERA, PARIS . . . . .  | 330          |
| <b>PLATE V</b>   |              |
| QUEEN VICTORIA NOTIFIED OF HER ACCESSION . . . . .   | 350          |
| <b>PLATE VI</b>  |              |
| CHURCH OF ST. BASIL, MOSCOW . . . . .  | 412          |
| <b>PLATE VII</b>   |              |
| GREAT TANGLEY MANOR IN SURREY, BUILT IN ELIZABETH'S<br>TIME . . . . .  | 476          |
| <b>PLATE VIII</b>  |              |
| MARSHAL FOCH . . . . .   | 580          |

## LIST OF COLORED MAPS

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Europe when Louis XIV began his Personal Government . . . . .        | 8    |
| Europe after the Treaties of Utrecht and Rastadt . . . . .           | 16   |
| Northeastern Europe in the Time of Peter the Great . . . . .         | 18   |
| The Partition of Poland . . . . .                                    | 32   |
| India about 1763 . . . . .   | 37   |
| England, France, and Spain in America, 1750 . . . . .                | 44   |
| Europe at the Time of Napoleon's Greatest Power, about 1810 . . . .  | 176  |
| Europe after 1815 . . . . .  | 198  |
| South America . . . . .  | 224  |
| Italy, 1814-1859 . . . . .   | 278  |
| Austria-Hungary, 1867-1918 . . . . .                                 | 302  |
| The German Empire, 1871-1918 . . . . .                               | 314  |
| The British Empire, 1914 . . . . .                                   | 396  |
| Western Portion of the Russian Empire, before the Revolution of 1917 | 406  |
| The European Advance (to 1914) in Asia . . . . .                     | 436  |
| Africa until 1914; Africa since the World War . . . . .              | 460  |
| Europe in 1914 . . . . .   | 528  |
| Southeastern Europe, 1907; Southeastern Europe, 1914 . . . . .       | 532  |
| Europe after the Treaty of Versailles, 1920 . . . . .                | 594  |

# HISTORY OF EUROPE: OUR OWN TIMES

## *BOOK I. INTRODUCTORY REVIEW OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*

### CHAPTER I

#### AGE OF LOUIS XIV AND THE CONTEST OVER SPAIN

##### I. CLUES TO MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

1. **What is History?** History is the story of man's achievements, his changing ways of living, and his frequent wars. It shows us how he has gradually accumulated more and more knowledge about himself and the world in which he lives; how he came upon ingenious inventions to make his life more comfortable; how he has built cities, established governments, carried on business, painted pictures, written books; how he has changed his opinions as his information increased. All these things make up what is called "civilization." In the first volume of this *History of Europe* an account was given of the growth of our civilization, beginning with the remote times when men used stone tools and lived in huts or caves and had not yet learned to write. The achievements of the ancient Egyptians, the Babylonians, and the Greeks and Romans were recalled. These were shown to underlie the civilization of Europe in the Middle Ages, from which our present knowledge and ways of life have gradually emerged.

The first volume covered an enormously long period of thousands of years. The present one is confined to what has happened during

the past two hundred and fifty years. It brings the record of mankind down to our own day and helps us to follow the new events which our newspapers and magazines report as the future unrolls.

**2. Three Great Wars.** This volume begins with the period of Louis XIV of France, whose reign illustrates the conditions two hundred and fifty years ago. A good deal will have to be said of wars, even if this be a dreary subject. Governments have hitherto sacrificed many people and much money to fighting, and we must understand how wars have come about if we are ever to succeed in doing away with war as we have with various other old evils.

It is a strange coincidence that each of the past three centuries opened with a terrible struggle among the powers of Europe. In 1713, as we shall see, the warring nations settled their quarrels by the Peace of Utrecht; in 1815 by the Peace of Paris; and in 1919 by the Peace of Versailles. It is most important to remember that America was involved in all these disputes and settlements—as English colonies in Queen Anne's War and as the United States in the War of 1812 and in the World War of our own time. Likewise, at the close of each, mankind, weary of bloody battles that seemed to yield only the fruits of death and destruction, was moved to consider ways of putting an end to all wars. The "Plan for Lasting Peace" of Abbé de St. Pierre was published in 1713; the Holy Alliance was conceived by the Tsar of Russia in 1815 (§ 367 below); the League of Nations was sponsored by President Wilson in 1918.

**3. Disappearance of Kings.** Among the chief causes of war in the past, has been the longing of kings to increase their realms. They regarded themselves as God's representatives on earth and not as the people's servants. One of the most astonishing changes since the time of Louis XIV is that kings have almost everywhere disappeared. They are rare birds today, compared with their numbers two hundred years ago. Republics have taken their place, in which the people are supposed to rule through their representatives. The French Revolution followed the example set by the English a hundred and more years earlier, and declared the will of the people supreme. The prevailing of democracy will be one of the chief subjects of this volume. We shall see how the great dynasties, such



as the Hohenzollerns of Prussia, the Hapsburgs of Austria, the Romanoffs of Russia, and the Ottoman line of Turkish rulers, all disappeared as a result of the World War. Whether the new republican governments will be less warlike remains to be seen.

**4. Europeanizing of the World.** One of the most astonishing of the events of the last two centuries has been the spread of European civilization throughout the whole world. European countries had in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries established colonies and trading centers in distant countries. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries North and South America, India, Siberia, the South Seas, and finally Africa came under the sway of various European powers. Great Britain outrivaled all in its foreign possessions and built up its vast navy to keep control of its overseas empire.

In the nineteenth century, steamships, railroads, and telegraphs, undreamed of in former days, tended to unite the whole globe and to create new difficulties in place of the old local European rivalries.

**5. World Trade.** The introduction of machinery into Europe made it possible to produce a far greater amount of goods than could be disposed of at home. This forced business men to find foreign markets for their surplus. The steamships, invented in the early part of the nineteenth century, enabled them to send their goods easily and rapidly to every part of the earth.

So to the rivalries of kings was added the competition of business men who wanted to sell their products. Many of the recent wars are closely associated with this struggle for business. China and Japan and many smaller Oriental countries began slowly to introduce European methods, to study European science, and establish schools of the type with which we are familiar. In this way our Western civilization has encircled the globe.

**6. Growth of the National Spirit.** During the nineteenth century there was a steady growth of nationalism—the desire to be free from the control of foreign governments. This developed in Germany, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and in various regions under Turkish rule—the Balkan provinces of the Sultan. Later the same tendency spread to Egypt, Syria, and even to India (where the British now find their former power threatened by those who would

cast off the foreign yoke, as they regard it). During the World War much was said of the "self-determination of nations," and as a result a number of new European states came into existence.

**Summary.** In these many forces are to be found the keys to the bewildering maze of wars, intrigues, revolutions, and crises which crowd the pages of our record. With these forces in mind we can comprehend clearly the ambitions of Louis XIV, who kept France at war during most of his long reign from 1643 to 1715; the militarism of the Hohenzollerns, who were then engaged in converting insignificant Prussia into one of the first powers of Europe; and the imperial pretensions of the Romanoffs, pushing Russia upon the European stage. Here are the clues to many wars over trade and empire and to revolutions that have changed the governments and policies of states. Through a warp of ambitions, intrigues, and commercial jealousy is shot a woof of peaceful ideals and democratic aspirations. Such is the texture of modern history.

## II. LOUIS XIV AND ABSOLUTE MONARCHY

**7. France at the Accession of Louis XIV.** Under the despotic rule of Louis XIV (1643-1715) France enjoyed a commanding influence in European affairs. After the wars between Catholics and Protestants (Huguenots) were over, the royal authority had been reëstablished by the wise conduct of Henry IV. Later, Richelieu had strengthened the monarchy by depriving the Huguenots of the exceptional privileges granted to them for their protection by Henry IV; he had also destroyed the fortified castles of the nobles, whose power had greatly increased during the turmoil of the Huguenot wars (see Vol. I,<sup>1</sup> §§ 787-795). His successor, Cardinal Mazarin, who conducted the government during Louis XIV's boyhood, was able to put down a last rising of the discontented nobility.

**8. What Richelieu and Mazarin had done for the French Monarchy.** When Mazarin died, in 1661, he left the young monarch with a kingdom such as no previous French king had enjoyed. The nobles, who for centuries had disputed the power

<sup>1</sup> Where "Vol. I" appears in cross references Robinson and Breasted, *History of Europe: Ancient and Medieval*, is meant.

with the king, were no longer feudal lords but only courtiers. The Huguenots, whose claim to a place in the State beside the Catholics had led to the terrible civil wars of the sixteenth century, were reduced in numbers and no longer held fortified towns from which they could defy the king's officers. Richelieu and Mazarin had successfully taken a hand in the Thirty Years' War, and France had come out of it with enlarged territory and increased importance in European affairs.

### 9. The Government of Louis XIV.

Louis XIV carried the work of these great ministers still farther. He gave that form to the French monarchy which it retained until the French Revolution. He made himself the very mirror of kingship. His marvelous court at Ver-



FIG. 1. LOUIS XIV

sailles became the model and the despair of other less rich and powerful princes, who accepted his theory of the absolute power of kings but could not afford to imitate his luxury. By his incessant wars he kept Europe in turmoil for over half a century. The distinguished generals who led his newly organized troops, and the wily diplomats who arranged his alliances and negotiated his treaties, made France feared and respected by even the most powerful of the other European states.

### 10. The Theory of the "Divine Right of Kings" in France.

Louis XIV had the same idea of kingship that James I had tried in vain to induce the English people to accept (Vol. I, §§ 827-828). God had given kings to men, and it was his will that monarchs

should be regarded as his representatives and that all those subject to them should obey them absolutely, without asking any questions or making any criticisms; for in submitting to their prince they were really submitting to God Himself. If the king was good and wise, his subjects should thank the Lord; if he proved foolish, cruel, or wasteful, they must accept their evil ruler as a well-deserved and just punishment which God had sent them for their sins. But in no case might they limit his power or rise against him.<sup>1</sup>

**11. Different Attitudes of English and French toward Absolute Monarchy.** Louis XIV had two great advantages over James I. In the first place, the English nation had always shown itself far more reluctant than France to place absolute power in the hands of its kings. By its Parliament, its courts, and its various declarations of the nation's rights it had built up traditions which made it impossible for the Stuarts to establish their claim to be absolute rulers. In France, on the other hand, there was no Great Charter or Bill of Rights. The French had, it is true, a sort of parliament, the so-called Estates General. But this assembly did not hold the purse strings (Vol. I, § 566), and the king was permitted to raise money without asking its permission or first attending to the complaints which it chose to make. It was therefore summoned only at irregular intervals. When Louis XIV took charge of the government, forty-seven years had passed without a meeting of the Estates General, and a century and a quarter was still to elapse before another call to the representatives of the nation was issued, in 1789.

Moreover, the French people placed far more reliance upon a powerful king than did the English, perhaps because they were not protected by the sea from their neighbors, as was England. On every side France had enemies ready to take advantage of any weakness or hesitation which might arise from disagreement between a parliament and the king. So the French felt it best,

<sup>1</sup> Louis XIV does not appear to have himself used the famous expression "*I am the State*," usually attributed to him, but it exactly corresponds to his idea of the relation of the king and the State.



on the whole, to leave all in the king's hands, even if the nation suffered at times from his tyranny.

**12. French Horror of Revolutionary England.** To the faithful subjects of Louis XIV England seemed to stand for godless revolution. She had actually put to death one of her kings and chased out another (Vol. I, §§ 842, 853). She permitted books to be printed which attacked the government and religious views sanctioned by the State. All this horrified the French, who enjoyed no such liberty. They thought of the English as revolutionists with no respect for authority, tradition, or religion. In short, England had the same reputation at the end of the seventeenth century that France gained at the end of the eighteenth.

**13. Personal Characteristics of Louis XIV.** Louis had another great advantage over James. He was a handsome man, of elegant and courtly mien and the most exquisite perfection of manner; even when playing billiards he is said to have retained an air of world mastery. The first of the Stuarts, on the contrary, was a very awkward man, whose slouching gait, intolerable manners, and pedantic conversation were utterly at variance with his lofty pretensions. Louis added, moreover, to his graceful exterior a sound judgment and quick apprehension. He said neither too much nor too little. He was, for a king, a hard worker and spent several hours a day attending to the business of government.

**14. The Strenuous Life of a Despotic Ruler.** It requires, in fact, a great deal of energy and application to be a real despot. In order thoroughly to understand and to solve the problems which constantly face the ruler of a great state, a monarch must, like Frederick the Great or Napoleon, rise early and toil late. Louis XIV was greatly aided by the able ministers who sat in his council, but he always retained for himself the place of first minister. He would never have consented to be dominated by an adviser, as his father had been by Richelieu. "The profession of the king," he declared, "is great, noble, and delightful if one but feels equal to performing the duties which it involves,"—and he never harbored a doubt that he himself was born for the business.



### III. HOW LOUIS ENCOURAGED ART AND LITERATURE

15. **The King's Palace at Versailles.** Louis XIV was careful that his surroundings should suit the grandeur of his office. His court was magnificent beyond anything that had been dreamed of in the West. He had an enormous palace constructed at Versailles, just outside of Paris, with interminable halls and apartments and a vast garden stretching away behind it. About this





FIG. 2. ONE OF THE VAST HALLS OF VERSAILLES

a town was laid out, where those lived who were privileged to be near his Majesty or supply the wants of the royal court. This palace and its outlying buildings, including two or three less gorgeous residences for the king when he occasionally tired of the ceremony of Versailles, probably cost the nation about a hundred million dollars, in spite of the fact that thousands of peasants and soldiers were forced to turn to and work on the buildings without pay. The furnishings and decorations were as rich and costly as the palace was splendid, and still fill the visitor with wonder. For over a century this magnificent "château" at Versailles continued to be the home of the French kings and the seat of their government.





15 10 5 0

55

Scotland  
Edinburgh  
**KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND**  
Belfast  
Dublin  
Ireland  
Wales  
England  
London  
North  
Amsterdam  
Utrecht  
Brussels  
Verdun  
Artois

ATLANTIC OCEAN

**EUROPE**

WHEN LOUIS XIV BEGAN HIS PERSONAL GOVERNMENT  
1661

45

Spanish Possessions  
Austrian Possessions  
Boundary of the Holy Roman Empire

0 100 200 300  
Scale of Miles

40

Paris  
Versailles  
R. Seine  
Franch  
**KINGDOM OF FRANCE**  
Avignon (Papal)  
C. of Roussillon  
Rhône

35

Lisbon  
**KINGDOM OF PORTUGAL**  
R. Tagus  
New Castile  
**KINGDOM OF SPAIN**  
Madrid  
Valencia  
Seville  
Granada  
Granada  
Gibraltar  
Ceuta (Spanish)

Old Castile  
Navarre  
Aragon  
PYRENEES  
Saragossa  
Barcelona  
Balearic Isles (To Spain)  
Iviza  
Majorca  
MEDITERRANEAN SEA  
AFRICA

10 Longitude West 0 Longitude East 5

M. N. ENG. BUFFALO.







**16. Life at Louis XIV's Court.** This splendor and luxury helped to attract the nobility, who no longer lived on their estates in well-fortified castles, planning how they might escape the royal control. They now dwelt in the effulgence of the king's countenance. They saw him to bed at night and in stately procession they greeted him in the morning. It was deemed a high honor to hand him his shirt as he was being dressed or, at dinner, to provide him with a fresh napkin. Only by living close to the king could the courtiers hope to gain favors, pensions, and lucrative offices for themselves and their friends, and perhaps occasionally to exercise some little influence upon the policy of the government. For they were now entirely dependent upon the good will of their monarch.

**17. The Reforms of Colbert.** The reforms which Louis XIV carried out in the earlier part of his reign were largely the work of the great financier Colbert, to whom France still looks back with gratitude. He early discovered that the king's officials were stealing and wasting vast sums. The offenders were arrested and forced to disgorge, and a new system of bookkeeping was introduced, similar to that employed by business men. He then turned his attention to increasing the manufactures of France by establishing new industries and seeing that the older ones kept to a high standard, which would make French goods sell readily in foreign markets.

**18. Art and Literature in the Reign of Louis XIV.** It was, however, as a patron of art and literature that Louis XIV gained much of his celebrity. Molière, who was at once a playwright and an actor, delighted the court with comedies in which he delicately made fun of the silly people and customs of his time. Corneille, who had gained renown by the great tragedy of *The Cid* in Richelieu's time, found a worthy successor in Racine, the most distinguished, perhaps, of French tragic poets.

Men of letters were generously aided by the king with pensions. Colbert encouraged the French Academy, which had been created by Richelieu. This body gave special attention to making the French tongue more eloquent and expressive by determining what



words should be used. It is now the greatest honor that a Frenchman can obtain to be made one of the forty members of this association. A magazine which still exists, the *Journal des Savants*, was founded for the promotion of science at this time. Colbert had an astronomical observatory built at Paris; and the Royal Library, which possessed only about sixteen thousand volumes, began to grow into that great collection of two and a half million volumes—by far the largest in existence—which to-day attracts scholars to Paris from all parts of the world. In short, Louis XIV and his ministers believed one of the chief objects of any government to be the promotion of art, literature, and science, and the example they set has been followed by almost every modern state.

All free discussion of political and religious questions was, however, stifled. Pamphlets and books praising the king and his works flowed from the printing presses, but all of them bore the stamp of servility or credulity. So it happened that when long afterward the people of France undertook to abolish absolutism their leaders had to turn to England for example and inspiration.

#### IV. LOUIS XIV ATTACKS HIS NEIGHBORS

**19. Louis XIV's Warlike Enterprises.** Unfortunately for France, the king's ambitions were by no means exclusively peaceful. Indeed, he regarded his wars as his chief glory. He employed a carefully reorganized army and the skill of his generals in a series of inexcusable attacks on his neighbors, in which he finally squandered all that Colbert's economies had accumulated and led France to the edge of financial ruin.

Louis XIV's predecessors had had, on the whole, little time to think of conquest. Louis himself was, however, now at liberty to look about him and consider how he might best realize the dream of his ancestors and perhaps reestablish the ancient boundaries which Cæsar reported that the Gauls had occupied. The "natural limits" of France appeared to be the Rhine on the north and east, the Jura Mountains and the Alps on the southeast, and to the south the Mediterranean and the Pyrenees. Richelieu had believed

that it was the chief end of his ministry to restore to France the boundaries determined for it by nature. Mazarin had labored hard to win Savoy and Nice and to reach the Rhine on the north. Before his death France at least gained Alsace and reached the Pyrenees (Vol. I., §§ 815, 817).

**20. The Invasion of the Netherlands (1667).** Louis XIV first turned his attention to the conquest of the Spanish Netherlands, to which he laid claim through his wife, the elder sister of the Spanish king, Charles II (1665-1700). He easily took a number of towns on the border of the Netherlands and then turned south and completely conquered Franche-Comté. This was an outlying province of Spain, isolated from her other lands, and a tempting morsel for the hungry king of France.

These conquests alarmed Europe, and especially Holland, which could not afford to have the barrier between it and France removed, for Louis XIV would be an uncomfortable neighbor. A Triple Alliance, composed of Holland, England, and Sweden, was accordingly organized to induce France to make peace with Spain. Louis contented himself for the moment with the dozen border towns that he had taken and which Spain ceded to him on condition that he would return Franche-Comté.

**21. Louis XIV's Invasion of Holland (1672).** Louis XIV then startled Europe again by seizing the duchy of Lorraine, which brought him to the border of Holland. At the head of a hundred thousand men he crossed the Rhine (1672) and easily conquered southern Holland. For the moment the Dutch cause appeared to be lost. But William of Orange showed the spirit of his great ancestor William the Silent; the sluices in the dikes were opened and the country flooded, so the French army was checked before it could take Amsterdam and advance into the north. The emperor, Leopold I, sent an army against Louis, and England showed a disposition to intervene on the side of Holland.

When a general peace was concluded at the end of six years, the chief provisions were that Holland should be left intact and that France should this time retain Franche-Comté, which had been conquered by Louis XIV in person. For the ten years

following there was no open war, but Louis seized the important free city of Strasbourg and made many other less conspicuous but equally unwarranted additions to his territory.

## V. LOUIS XIV AND HIS PROTESTANT SUBJECTS

**22. Situation of the Huguenots at the Beginning of Louis XIV's Reign.** Louis XIV exhibited as woeful a want of statesmanship in the treatment of his Protestant subjects as in the prosecution of disastrous wars. The Huguenots, deprived of their former military and political power, had turned to manufacture, trade, and banking; "as rich as a Huguenot" had become a proverb in France. There were perhaps a million of them among fifteen million Frenchmen, and they undoubtedly formed a thrifty and enterprising part of the nation. The Catholic clergy, however, did not cease to urge the complete suppression of heresy.

**23. Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and its Results.** Louis XIV had scarcely taken the reins of government into his own hands before the perpetual nagging and injustice to which the Protestants had been subjected at all times took a more serious form. Upon one pretense or another their churches were demolished. Children were authorized to renounce Protestantism when they reached the age of seven. Rough dragoons were quartered upon the Huguenots with the hope that the insulting behavior of the soldiers might frighten the heretics into accepting the religion of the king.

At last Louis XIV was led by his officials to believe that practically all the Huguenots had been converted by these harsh measures. In 1685, therefore, he revoked the Edict of Nantes, and the Protestants thereby became outlaws and their ministers subject to the death penalty. Thousands of the Huguenots succeeded in eluding the vigilance of the royal officials and fled, some to England, some to Prussia, some to America, carrying with them their skill and industry to strengthen France's rivals. This was the last great and terrible example in western Europe of fierce religious intolerance.

**24. Louis's Operations in the Rhenish Palatinate.** Louis XIV now set his heart upon conquering the Palatinate, a Protestant land, to which he easily discovered that he had a claim. The rumor of his intention and the indignation occasioned in Protestant countries by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes resulted in an alliance against the French king headed by William of Orange. Louis speedily justified the suspicions of Europe by a frightful devastation of the Palatinate, burning whole towns and destroying many castles, including the exceptionally beautiful one of the elector at Heidelberg. Ten years later, however, Louis agreed to a peace which put things back as they were before the struggle began. He was preparing for the final and most ambitious undertaking of his life, which precipitated the longest and bloodiest war of all his warlike reign.

## VI. WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION

**25. The Question of the Spanish Succession.** The king of Spain, Charles II, was childless and brotherless, and Europe had long been discussing what would become of his vast realms when his sickly existence should come to an end. Louis XIV had married one of his sisters, and the emperor, Leopold I, another, and these two ambitious rulers had been considering for some time how they might divide the Spanish possessions between the Bourbons of France and the Austrian Hapsburgs. But when Charles II died in 1700, it was discovered that he had left a will in which he made Louis's younger grandson, Philip, the heir to his twenty-two crowns, but on the condition that France and Spain should never be united.

**26. Louis's Grandson Philip becomes King of Spain.** It was a weighty question whether Louis XIV should permit his grandson to accept this hazardous honor. Should Philip become king of Spain, Louis and his family would control all of France and all the vast Spanish possessions and colonies; namely, southwestern Europe from Holland to Sicily, as well as a great part of North and South America. This would mean the establishment



of an empire more powerful than that of Charles V (Vol. I, § 721). It was clear that the disinherited emperor and the ever-watchful William of Orange, now king of England (Vol. I, § 854), would never permit this unprecedented extension of French influence. They had already shown themselves ready to make great sacrifices in order to check far less serious aggressions on the part of the French king. Nevertheless, family pride and personal ambition led Louis to risk the welfare of his country. He accepted the will and informed the Spanish ambassador at the French court that he might salute Philip V as his new king. The leading French newspaper of the time proclaimed that the Pyrenees were no more.

**27. The War of the Spanish Succession.** King William soon succeeded in forming a new Grand Alliance (1701) in which Louis's old enemies, England, Holland, and the emperor, were the most important members. William himself died just as hostilities were beginning, but the long War of the Spanish Succession was carried on vigorously by the great English general, the duke of Marlborough, and the Austrian commander, Eugene of Savoy. The conflict was more general than the Thirty Years' War; even in America there was fighting between French and English colonists, which passes in American histories under the name of Queen Anne's War. All the more important battles went against the French, and after ten years of war, which was rapidly ruining the country by the destruction of its people and its wealth, Louis XIV was willing to consider some compromise, and after long discussion a peace was arranged in 1713.

**28. The Treaty of Utrecht (1713).** The Treaty of Utrecht changed the map of Europe as no previous treaty had done, not even that of Westphalia (Vol. I, § 817). Each of the chief combatants got his share of the Spanish booty over which they had been fighting. The Bourbon Philip V was permitted to retain Spain and its colonies on condition that the Spanish and French crowns should never rest on the same head. To Austria fell the Spanish Netherlands, hereafter called the Austrian Netherlands, which continued to form a barrier between Holland and France. Holland received certain fortresses to make its position still more



secure. The Spanish possessions in Italy, that is, Naples and Milan, were also given to Austria, and in this way Austria got the hold on Italy which it retained until 1866. From France, England acquired Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the Hudson Bay region, and so began the expulsion of the French from North America. Besides these she received the rock of Gibraltar, which still gives her command of the narrow entrance to the Mediterranean.

**29. The Development of International Law.** The period of Louis XIV is remarkable for the development of international law. The incessant wars and great alliances made increasingly clear the need of well-defined rules governing states in their relations with one another both in peace and in war. It was of the utmost importance to determine, for instance, the rights of vessels of neutral powers not engaged in the war, and what should be considered fair conduct in warfare and in the treatment of prisoners.

The first great systematic treatise on international law was published by Grotius in 1625, when the horrors of the Thirty Years' War (Vol. I, §§ 807 ff.) were impressing men's minds with the necessity of finding some means other than war of settling disputes between nations. While the rules laid down by Grotius and later writers have, as we must sadly admit, by no means put an end to war, they have prevented many conflicts by increasing the ways in which nations could come to an understanding with one another through their ambassadors without recourse to arms.

**30. Death of Louis XIV (1715).** Louis XIV outlived his son and his grandson and left a terribly demoralized kingdom to his five-year-old great-grandson, Louis XV (1715-1774). The national treasury was empty; the people were reduced in numbers and were in a miserable state. "I have known in France," exclaimed an English traveler, "poor people to sell their beds and lie upon straw; sell their pots, kettles, and all their necessary household goods to content the unmerciful collectors of the king's taxes." No wonder that Voltaire on attending the funeral of the king found the people along the way rejoicing instead of weeping. The French army, once the finest in Europe, was in no condition to gain further victories.

## QUESTIONS

I. What have been the chief causes of European wars during the past two centuries? What do you understand by "democracy"? by "militarism"? On what occasions has the United States become involved in European wars?

II. Explain the idea of the divine right of kings. Why do you think that many good and wise people have accepted the idea? Why was it more appropriate in France than in England?

III. What can you say of Versailles? Describe the life at the French court. What were the chief reforms of Colbert? Who were some of the chief writers of Louis XIV's time?

IV. What were Louis XIV's military enterprises before the War of the Spanish Succession? What additions did he make to French territory?

V. Who were the Huguenots? How did they differ from the Catholics in belief? What was the Edict of Nantes? Why did Louis XIV venture to revoke it? What were the results of the revocation?


VI. What were the causes of the War of the Spanish Succession? What were the chief provisions of the Peace of Utrecht? What is international law? What kind of cases does it deal with?

## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) the divine-right theory of kingship, pp. 4-8; (2) life at the French court, pp. 8-12; (3) Louis XIV's plans for enlarging his kingdom, pp. 15-17, 22-27; (4) condition of Spain and the Spanish-succession question, pp. 17-18, 42-46; (5) England's reasons for waging war on France, pp. 36-38, 39-41, 46-48; (6) the gains of England in the wars against France, pp. 50-53.

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the age of Louis XIV, pp. 235-242; (2) extension of the French frontiers, pp. 242-249; (3) the War of the Spanish Succession, pp. 249-256; (4) the Puritan Revolution in England, pp. 261-281; (5) Restoration and Revolution in England, pp. 281-293.

Draw a map of Europe after the Treaty of Utrecht, based on Lesson V in BISHOP and ROBINSON, *Practical Map Exercises in Medieval and Modern European History*.









10

15

20

25

30

55

50

45

40

35

Greenwich

10

15

20

25





## CHAPTER II

### RUSSIA AND PRUSSIA BECOME EUROPEAN POWERS

#### I. BEGINNINGS OF RUSSIA

**31. Emergence of Two New European Powers.** Down to the time of Louis XIV the history of Europe is chiefly concerned with France, England, the Netherlands, the old Holy Roman Empire, Spain, and Italy. During the past two hundred years two other states, Prussia and Russia, have become European powers and have played a great and menacing rôle in the affairs of western Europe and of the world. The ambitions of Prussia finally united most of the civilized nations of the globe against her in the World War, and then the Bolshevik revolution in Russia seemed to many to threaten the whole existing order. We must, accordingly, turn now from the Rhine and the Pyrenees to the shores of the Baltic and the vast plains of eastern Europe in order to see how these two states grew up and became actors in the great drama of humanity.

While the long War of the Spanish Succession had been in progress, due to Louis XIV's anxiety to add Spain to the possessions of his family, another conflict was raging in the North, and changes were taking place there comparable in importance to those which were ratified by the Peace of Utrecht. Russia, which had hitherto faced eastward, was turning toward the West, upon which she was destined to exert an ever-increasing influence, extending even to our own country. The newly founded kingdom of Prussia was gathering its forces for those warlike enterprises which have characterized its history and which finally played an important part in a disaster so great that it is impossible for the human imagination fully to appreciate the tragedy.

**32. The Slavic Peoples.** We have had little occasion hitherto, in dealing with the history of western Europe, to refer to the Slavic

peoples, to whom the Russians, Poles, Bohemians, and many other nations of eastern Europe belong. Together they form the most numerous race in Europe, but only recently has their history begun to merge into that of the world at large. In the eighteenth century Russia first began to take an increasingly important part in European affairs. Before the World War, which began in 1914, the realms of the Tsar which lay in Europe exceeded in extent those of all the other rulers of the continent put together, and yet they were scarcely more than a quarter of his whole dominion, which embraced northern and central Asia—an empire nearly three times the size of the United States.

The Slavs were settled along the Dnieper, Don, and Vistula Rivers long before the Christian Era. After the East Goths had penetrated into the Roman Empire (Vol. I, § 458) the Slavs followed their example and invaded the Balkan Peninsula. Other Slavic hordes pushed later into eastern Germany. The Bohemians and Moravians, who are Slavs, still hold an advanced position close to the borders of Germany.


**33. Beginnings of Russia.** In the ninth century some of the Northmen invaded the districts to the east of the Baltic, while their relatives were causing grievous trouble in France and England (Vol. I, §§ 520, 537, 540). It is generally supposed that one of their leaders, Rurik, was the first to consolidate the Slavic tribes about Novgorod into a sort of state, in 862. Rurik's successor extended the bounds of the new empire to the south as far as the Dnieper River. The word "Russia" is probably derived from *Rous*, the name given by the neighboring Finns to the Norman adventurers. Before the end of the tenth century the Greek form of Christianity was introduced and the Russian ruler was baptized. Then came a great disaster which put Russia back for centuries.

**34. The Tartar Invasion.** Russia is geographically nothing more than an extension of the vast plain of northern Asia, which the Russians were destined finally to conquer. It was therefore exposed to the great invasion of the Tartars, or Mongols, who swept in from the east in the thirteenth century. The powerful Tartar ruler, Genghis Khan (1162-1227), conquered northern

# NORTHEASTERN EUROPE in the time of PETER THE GREAT

SCALE OF MILES  
50 100 200 300 400

Territory added to Russia  
by Peter the Great



NOTE: The boundaries of the various powers are of the year of accession of Peter the Great

THE MATTHEWS-ARTHUR CO. N.Y.





China and central Asia, and the mounted hordes of his successors crossed into Europe and overran Russia, which had fallen apart into numerous principalities. The Russian princes became the dependents of the Great Khan and had frequently to seek his far-distant court, some three thousand miles away, where he freely disposed of both their crowns and their heads. The Tartars exacted tribute of the Russians but left them undisturbed in their laws and religion.

**35. Influence of the Tartar Occupation on Russia.** When the Mongol power had begun to decline in strength the princes of Moscow—the most important of the Russian vassals of the Khan—ventured, in 1480, to kill the Mongol ambassadors sent to demand tribute and thus freed themselves from the Mongol yoke. But the Tartar occupation had left its mark, for the princes of Moscow imitated the Khans (emperors at Constantinople) rather than the Western rulers, of whom, in fact, they knew nothing. In 1547 Ivan the Terrible assumed the title of "Tsar,"<sup>1</sup> which was the Russian equivalent of the title "king," or "emperor." The costumes and etiquette of the court were also Oriental. The Russian armor suggested that of the Chinese, and their headdress was a turban. It was the task of Peter the Great to Europeanize Russia.

## II. PETER THE GREAT

**36. Peter the Great (1672-1725).** At the time of Peter's accession, in 1672, Russia, which had grown greatly under Ivan the Terrible and other enterprising rulers, still had no outlet to the sea. In manners and customs the kingdom was Asiatic, and its government was like that of a Tartar prince. Peter had no objection to the despotic power which fell to him, but he knew that Russia was very much behind the rest of Europe and that his crudely equipped soldiers could never make head against the well-armed and well-disciplined troops of the West. He had no seaport

<sup>1</sup> The word "Tsar," or "Czar," is derived from "Cæsar" (German, *Kaiser*), but was used in Slavic books for the title of the kings of antiquity as well as for the Roman emperors. Peter the Great called himself "Imperator"; that is, "emperor." The Tsar was also known as "Autocrat of all the Russias."

and no ships, and without these Russia could never hope to take part in the world's affairs. His two great tasks were therefore to introduce Western habits into his barbarous realms and to "make a window," as he expressed it, through which Russia might look abroad.




FIG. 3. PETER THE GREAT

Peter was a tall, strong man, impulsive in action, sometimes vulgarly familiar, but always retaining an air of command. When he visited Louis XV of France in 1717 he astonished the court by taking the seven-year-old king under the arms and hoisting him up in the air to kiss him. The courtiers were much shocked at his conduct

**37. Peter's Travels in Europe.** In 1697-1698 Peter himself visited Germany, Holland, and England for the purpose of investigating every art and science of the West, as well as the most approved methods of manufacture, from the making of a man-of-war to the etching of an engraving. Nothing escaped the keen eyes of this rude, half-savage Northern giant. For a week he put on the wide breeches of a Dutch laborer and worked in the shipyard at Zaandam near Amsterdam. In England, Holland, and Germany he engaged artisans, scientific men, architects, ship captains, and those versed in

artillery and in the training of troops—all of whom he took back with him to aid in the reform and development of Russia.

**38. Peter's Reform Measures.** Peter was called home by the revolt of Russian nobles and churchmen who were horrified at his desertion of the habits and customs of his forefathers. They hated what they called "German ideas," such as short coats, tobacco smoking, and shaven faces. Peter took a fearful revenge upon the

rebels and is said to have himself cut off the heads of many of them. Like the barbarian that he was at heart he left their heads and bodies lying about all winter, unburied, in order to make the terrible results of revolt against his power quite plain to all.

Peter's reforms extended throughout his whole reign. He made his people give up their cherished oriental beards and long flowing garments. He required the women of the richer classes, who had been kept in a sort of oriental harem, to come out and meet the men in social assemblies, such as were common in the West. He invited foreigners to settle in Russia and sent young Russians abroad to study. He reorganized the government officials on the model of a Western kingdom and made over his army in the same way.

**39. Founding of St. Petersburg.** Finding that the old capital, Moscow, clung persistently to its ancient habits, Peter prepared to found a new capital for his new Russia. He selected for this purpose a bit of territory on the Baltic which he had conquered from Sweden—very marshy, it is true, but where he might hope to construct Russia's first real port. Here he built St. Petersburg<sup>1</sup> at enormous expense and colonized it with Russians and foreigners. Russia was at last becoming a European power.

**40. Russia gains on the Baltic.** The next problem was to get control of the provinces lying between the Russian boundary and the Baltic Sea. These belonged to Sweden, which happened to have at that time a very warlike young monarch, Charles XII. He filled Europe with astonishment for a time by engaging in war with Denmark, Poland, and Russia and gaining many surprising victories. But his attempt to penetrate into Russia proved as fatal to him as a similar attempt did to Napoleon a century later. His prowess only served to set back Russia's plans for the moment. Three years after his death, which occurred in 1718, Peter found himself in a position to force Sweden to cede him Livonia, Esthonia, and other Swedish territory which had previously cut Russia off from the sea.

<sup>1</sup> Changed to *Petrograd* in 1914 so that the Russian capital should no longer be called by a German name; then renamed Leningrad by the Bolsheviks, after their leader.

41. **Peter's Attempt to reach the Black Sea.** Peter looked with longing eyes on the possessions of the Turks to the south of him, and he made vain attempts to extend the Russian control as far as the Black Sea. He did not succeed in this, but it had become evident that if the Turks were to be driven from Europe, Russia would prove a mighty rival of the other European powers in the division of the spoils.

For a generation after the death of Peter the Great, Russia fell into the hands of incompetent rulers. It only appears again as a European state when the great Catherine II came to the throne, in 1762. From that time on, the Western powers had always to consider the vast Slavic empire in all their great struggles. They had also to consider a new kingdom in northern Germany, which was just growing into a great power as Peter began his work. This was Prussia, whose beginnings we must now consider.

### III. ORIGIN OF THE KINGDOM OF PRUSSIA

42. **Brandenburg and the Hohenzollerns.** The electorate of Brandenburg had figured on the map of Germany for centuries, and there was no particular reason to suppose that it was to become one day the dominant state in Germany and, finally, a great menace to the world. Early in the fifteenth century the old line of electors had died out, and Emperor Sigismund had sold Brandenburg to a hitherto unimportant house, the Hohenzollerns, which is known to us now through such names as those of Frederick the Great, of William I, the first German emperor, and of his grandson, the notorious "kaiser," William II. Beginning with a strip of territory extending some ninety or a hundred miles to the east and to the west of the little town of Berlin, the successive representatives of the line gradually extended their boundaries until the kingdom of Prussia finally embraced nearly two thirds of Germany. Of the earlier little annexations nothing need be said. While it has always been the pride of the Hohenzollern family that almost every one of its reigning members has added something to what his ancestors handed down to him, no great



extension took place until just before the Thirty Years' War. Then it was that the electors of Brandenburg got a foothold on the banks of the Rhine. They also inherited (1618), far to the east, the duchy of Prussia, which was separated from Brandenburg by Polish territory. "Prussia" was originally the name of a region on the Baltic inhabited by heathen Slavs.

43. The Territories of the Great Elector (1640-1688). Notwithstanding this substantial territorial gain, there was little promise that the hitherto obscure electorate would ever become



TERRITORIES OF THE GREAT ELECTOR OF BRANDENBURG

a formidable power when, in 1640, Frederick William, known as the Great Elector, came to the throne of Brandenburg. His territories were scattered from the Rhine to the Vistula, his army was of small account, and his authority was disputed by powerful nobles. The center of his domain was Brandenburg. Far to the west was Mark, bordering on the Rhine valley, and Cleves, lying on both banks of that river. Far to the east, beyond the Vistula, was the duchy of Prussia (see map).

The Great Elector was, however, well fitted for the task of welding these domains into a powerful state. He was coarse by nature, heartless in destroying opponents, treacherous in diplomatic negotiations, and entirely devoid of the refinement which distinguished his contemporary, Louis XIV, and his court. He resolutely set to work to increase his territories and his power.



By shrewd tactics during the closing days of the Thirty Years' War he managed to secure, by the Treaty of Westphalia (Vol. I, § 817), two bishoprics and the duchy of Farther Pomerania, which gave him a good shore line on the Baltic.

**44. Reforms of the Great Elector.** Knowing that the interests of his house depended on military strength, he organized,




FIG. 4. PRUSSIAN MILITARY PUNISHMENT

The armies of the eighteenth century were mostly made up of hired soldiers or serfs, and the officers maintained discipline by cruel punishments. In this picture of a Prussian regiment one soldier is being flogged while half suspended by his wrists; another is forced to walk between two files of soldiers who must beat his bare back with heavy rods. It has been said that these soldiers found war a relief from the terrors of peace, since in war time the punishments were lessened

in spite of the protests of the taxpayers, an army out of all proportion to the size and wealth of his dominions. This was the beginning of that great Prussian war machine which was developed as time went on and showed its tremendous strength in the conflict that began in 1914. He succeeded in creating an absolute monarchy on the model furnished by Louis XIV. He joined with

England and Holland in their alliances against Louis, and the army of Brandenburg began to be known and feared.

**45. Brandenburg becomes the Kingdom of Prussia (1701).** It was accordingly a splendid legacy which the Great Elector left in 1688 to his son, Frederick I. Although the career of the latter was by no means so brilliant as that of his father, he induced the emperor to permit him to change his title from "elector" to "king" and so to transform his *electorate* into a *kingdom*. The title "King in Prussia"<sup>1</sup> was deemed preferable to the more natural "King of Brandenburg" because Prussia lay wholly without the bounds of the empire, and consequently its ruler was not in any sense subject to the emperor but was entirely independent.

**46. Militarism of Frederick William I (1713-1740).** The second ruler of the new kingdom, Frederick William I, the father of Frederick the Great, was a rough and boorish king who devoted himself entirely to governing his realm, collecting tall soldiers, drilling his battalions, hunting wild game, and smoking strong tobacco. He was passionately fond of military life from his childhood. He took special pride in stalwart soldiers and collected them at great expense from all parts of Europe. He raised the Prussian army, which numbered twenty-seven thousand in the days of the Great Elector, to eighty-four thousand, making it almost equal to that maintained by France or Austria. He was constantly drilling and reviewing his men, whom he addressed as "my blue children."

Moreover, by constant management, miserly thrift, and entire indifference to luxury, Frederick William treasured up a huge sum of money. He discharged a large number of court servants, sold at auction many of the royal jewels, and had a great part of the family table silver coined into money. Consequently he was able to leave to his son, Frederick II, not only a powerful army but an ample supply of gold. Indeed, it was his toil and economy that made possible the achievements of his far more distinguished son.

<sup>1</sup> He was not king of all of Prussia. Frederick the Great changed his title to "King of Prussia" after the incorporation of the rest of Prussia by the partition of Poland.

## IV. THE WARS OF FREDERICK THE GREAT

**47. Accession of Frederick II, called "the Great" (1740-1786).** In his early years Frederick II grieved and disgusted his boorish old father by his dislike for military life and his interest in books and music. He was a particular admirer of the French and preferred their language to his own. No sooner had he become king, however, than he suddenly developed marvelous energy and skill in warlike enterprises. Chance favored his designs.

**48. Frederick's Attack upon Silesia.** The Emperor Charles VI, the last representative of the direct male line of the Hapsburgs, died in 1740, just a few months before Frederick ascended the throne, leaving only a daughter, Maria Theresa, to inherit his vast and miscellaneous dominions. He had induced the other European powers to promise to accept the solemn will, in which he left everything to the young Maria Theresa; but she had no sooner begun to reign than her greedy neighbors prepared to seize her lands. Her greatest enemy was the newly crowned king of Prussia, who at first pretended friendship for her. Frederick determined to seize Silesia, a strip of Hapsburg territory lying to the southeast of Brandenburg. He accordingly marched his army into the coveted district and occupied the important city of Breslau without declaring war or offering any excuse except a vague claim to a portion of the land.<sup>1</sup>

**49. The War of the Austrian Succession.** France, stimulated by Frederick's example, joined with Bavaria in the attack upon Maria Theresa. It seemed for a time as if her struggle to keep her realm intact would be in vain, but the loyalty of all the various peoples under her scepter was roused by her extraordinary courage and energy. The French were driven back, but Maria Theresa was forced to grant Silesia to Frederick in order

<sup>1</sup> As no woman had ever been elected empress, the duke of Bavaria managed to secure the Holy Roman Empire, as Emperor Charles VII. Upon his death, however, in 1745, Maria Theresa's husband, Francis, duke of Lorraine, was chosen emperor. Their son, Joseph II, succeeded his father in 1765, and upon his death, in 1790, his brother Leopold II was elected. When he died, in 1792, the empire fell to his son Francis II, who was the last of the "Roman" emperors and assumed the new title "Emperor of Austria."



to induce him to retire from the war. Finally, England and Holland joined in an alliance for maintaining the balance of power, for they had no desire to see France annex the Austrian Netherlands. A few years later (1748) all the powers, tired of the war,—which is known as the War of the Austrian Succession,—laid down their arms and agreed to what is called in diplomacy the *status quo ante bellum*, which simply means that things were to be restored to the condition in which they had been before the opening of hostilities.

**50. Policy of Frederick the Great.** Frederick was, however, permitted to keep Silesia, which increased his dominions by about one third of their former extent. He now turned some of his attention to making his kingdom richer by draining the swamps, promoting industry, and drawing up a new code of laws. He found time, also, to gratify his interest in men




FIG. 5. FREDERICK THE GREAT

of letters and invited Voltaire, the famous French writer, to make his home at Berlin. It will not seem strange to anyone who knows anything of the characters of these two men that they quarreled after two or three years and that Voltaire left the Prussian king with very bitter feelings (see below, § 152).

**51. The Seven Years' War; the Alliance between France and Austria.** Maria Theresa was by no means reconciled to the loss of Silesia, and she began to lay her plans for expelling the perfidious Frederick and regaining her lost territory. This led to one of the most important wars in modern history, in which not only almost every European power joined but which involved

the whole world, from the Indian rajahs of Hindustan to the colonists of Virginia and New England. This Seven Years' War (1756-1763) will be considered in its broader aspects in the next chapter. We shall mention here only the part played in it by the king of Prussia.

Maria Theresa's ambassador at Paris was so skillful in his negotiations with the French court that in 1756 he induced it, in spite of its two hundred years of hostility to the House of Hapsburg, to enter into an alliance with Austria against Prussia. Russia, Sweden, and Saxony also agreed to join in a concerted attack on Prussia. Their armies, coming as they did from every point of the compass, threatened the complete annihilation of Austria's rival. It seemed as if Frederick's armies might be wiped out and the new kingdom of Prussia might disappear altogether from the map of Europe.

**52. Frederick's Victorious Defense.** However, it was in this war that Frederick obtained his title of "the Great" and showed himself the equal of the ablest generals the world has seen, from Alexander to Napoleon. Undaunted by the overwhelming numbers of his enemies and by the loss of several battles, Frederick defeated the French and his German enemies in the most famous, perhaps, of his conflicts, at Rossbach in 1757. A month later he routed the Austrians brilliantly at Leuthen, not far from Breslau. Thereupon the Swedes and the Russians retired from the field and left Frederick for the moment master of the situation.

England now engaged the French and left Frederick at liberty to deal with his other enemies. Money paid him by the English government helped him to stay in the field, but for a time it looked as if he might, after all, be vanquished. But the accession of a new Tsar, who was an ardent admirer of Frederick, led Russia to conclude peace with Prussia, whereupon Maria Theresa reluctantly agreed to give up once more her struggle with her inveterate enemy. Shortly afterwards England and France came to terms, and a general settlement was made at Paris in 1763 (see below, § 75).



V. THREE PARTITIONS OF POLAND, 1772, 1793, AND 1795

**53. Question of West Prussia.** Frederick's success in seizing and holding one of Austria's finest provinces did not satisfy him. The central portions of his kingdom—Brandenburg, Silesia, and Pomerania—were completely cut off from East Prussia by a considerable tract known as West Prussia, which belonged to the kingdom of Poland. The upper map on page 31 will show how great must have been Frederick's temptation to fill this gap, especially as he well knew that Poland was in no condition to defend its possessions.

**54. Weakness of Poland.** With the exception of Russia, Poland was the largest kingdom in Europe. It covered an immense plain with no natural boundaries, and the population, which was very thinly scattered, belonged to several races. Besides the Poles themselves there were Germans in the cities of West Prussia and Russians in Lithuania. The Jews were very numerous everywhere, forming half of the population in some of the towns. The Poles were usually Catholics, while the Germans were Protestants and the Russians adhered to the Greek Church. These differences in religion, added to those of race, created endless problems and dissensions and explain many of the difficulties involved in the attempt to reestablish an independent Polish republic since the great World War.

The government of Poland was the worst imaginable. Instead of having developed a strong monarchy, as her neighbors—Prussia, Russia, and Austria—had done, she remained in a state of feudal anarchy, which the nobles had taken the greatest pains to perpetuate by binding their kings in such a way that they had no power either to maintain order or to defend the country from attack. The king could not declare war, make peace, impose taxes, or pass any law without the consent of the diet. As the diet was composed of representatives of the nobility, any one of whom could freely veto any measure,—for no measure could pass that had even one vote against it,—most of the diets broke up without accomplishing anything.

The kingship was not hereditary in Poland, but whenever the ruler died the nobles assembled and chose a new one, commonly a foreigner. These elections were tumultuous, and the various European powers regularly interfered, by force or bribery, to secure the election of a candidate who they believed would favor their interests.

**55. The Polish Nobles and Peasants.** The nobles in Poland were numerous. There were perhaps a million and a half of them, mostly very poor, owning only a trifling bit of land. There was a saying that the poor noble's dog, even if he sat in the middle of his master's estate, was sure to have his tail upon a neighbor's land. There was no middle class except in the few German towns. The peasants were miserable indeed. They had sunk from serfs to slaves, over whom their lords had even the right of life and death.

**56. First Partition of Poland (1772).** It required no great insight to see that Poland was in danger of falling a prey to her greedy and powerful neighbors, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, who clamped in the unfortunate kingdom on all sides. They had long shamelessly interfered in its affairs and had actually taken active measures to oppose all reforms of the constitution in order that they might profit by the chronic anarchy.

The ruler of Russia was the famous Catherine II (see below, §§ 153-155), who arranged with Frederick the Great to prevent any improvement in Poland and to keep up and encourage the disorder. Finally, Poland's kind neighbors, including Austria, agreed, in 1772, each to take a slice of the unhappy kingdom.

Austria was assigned a strip inhabited by almost three million Poles and Russians and thus added two new kinds of people and two new languages to her already varied collection of races and tongues. Prussia was given a smaller piece, but it was the coveted West Prussia, which she needed in order to fill out her boundaries, and its inhabitants were to a considerable extent Germans and Protestants. Russia's strip, on the east, was largely inhabited entirely by Russians. The Polish diet was forced, by the advance of Russian troops to Warsaw, to approve the partition.





**57. Revival of Poland (1772-1791).** Poland seemed at first, however, to have learned a great lesson from the disaster. During the twenty years following its first dismemberment there was an extraordinary revival in education, art, and literature. Historians and poets sprang up to give distinction to the last days of Polish independence. The constitution which had made Poland the laughingstock and the victim of its neighbors was abolished, and an entirely new one worked out. It did away with the free veto of the nobles, made the crown hereditary, and established a parliament somewhat like that of England.

Russia had no desire that Poland should become a strong monarchy, and it sent soldiers to help the enemies of the new constitution on the ground that Russia could not bear to see any changes in the government "under which the Polish commonwealth had flourished for so many centuries." Russia and Prussia, having secured the continuance of disorder in Poland, declared that they could not put up with such a dangerous neighbor and proceeded to a second partition in 1793.

**58. Second Partition (1793).** Prussia cut deep into Poland, added a million and a half of Poles to her subjects, and acquired the towns of Thorn, Danzig, and Posen. Russia's gains were three millions of people, who at least belonged to her own race. On this occasion Austria was put off with the promises of her confederates, Russia and Prussia, that they would use their good offices to secure Bavaria for her in exchange for the Austrian Netherlands (§ 28).

**59. Revolt of Kosciusko (1794).** At this juncture the Poles found a national leader in the brave Kosciusko, who had fought under Washington for American liberty. With the utmost care and secrecy he organized an insurrection in the spring of 1794 and summoned the Polish people to join his standard of national independence. The Poles who had been incorporated into the Prussian monarchy thereupon rose and forced Prussia to withdraw its forces.

**60. Third and Final Partition (1795).** Russia was ready, however, to crush the patriots. Kosciusko was wounded and







captured in battle, and by the end of the year Russia was in control of Warsaw. The Polish king was compelled to abdicate, and the remnants of the dismembered kingdom were divided, after much bitter contention, among Austria, Russia, and Prussia. In the three partitions which blotted the kingdom of Poland from the map of Europe, Russia received nearly twice the combined shares of Austria and Prussia.

## VI. THE AUSTRIAN REALMS: MARIA THERESA AND JOSEPH II

**61. The Hapsburgs in Austria.** While the Hohenzollerns of Prussia from their capital at Berlin had been extending their power over northern Germany, the great house of Hapsburg, established in the southeastern corner of Germany, with its capital at Vienna, had been grouping together, by conquest or inheritance, the vast realm over which it ruled down to the end of the World War, in 1918. Emperor Charles V, who early in the sixteenth century found himself ruler of an all too vast realm, ceded to his brother, Ferdinand I, the German or Austrian possessions of the house of Hapsburg (Vol. I, § 779), while he himself retained the Spanish, Burgundian, and Italian dominions. Ferdinand, by a fortunate marriage with the heiress of the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary, greatly augmented his territory. Hungary was, however, almost completely conquered by the Turks at that time, and till the end of the seventeenth century the energies of the Austrian rulers were largely absorbed in a long struggle against the Mohammedans.

**62. Conquests of the Turks in Europe.** A Turkish tribe from western Asia had, at the opening of the fourteenth century, established themselves in western Asia Minor under their leader, Othman (d. 1326). It was from him that they derived their name of Ottoman Turks, to distinguish them from the Seljuk Turks, with whom the crusaders had come into contact (Vol. I, § 602). The leaders of the Ottoman Turks showed great energy. They not only extended their Asiatic territory far toward the east, and

later into Africa, but they gained a footing in Europe as early as 1353. They gradually conquered the Slavic peoples in Macedonia and occupied the territory about Constantinople, although it was a hundred years before they succeeded in capturing the ancient capital of the Eastern Empire.

This advance of the Turks naturally aroused grave fears in the states of western Europe lest they too might be deprived of their independence. The brunt of the defense against the common foe devolved upon Venice and the German Hapsburgs, who carried on an almost continuous war with the Turks for nearly two centuries. As late as 1683 the Mohammedans collected a large force and besieged Vienna, which might very well have fallen into their hands had it not been for the timely assistance which the city received from the king of Poland. From this time on, the power of the Turks in Europe rapidly decreased, and the Hapsburgs were able to regain the whole



FIG. 6. MARIA THERESA

territory of Hungary and Transylvania. Their possession of these lands, which they held until 1918, was recognized by the Sultan in 1699.

**63. Heterogeneous Population under the Hapsburgs.** The conquest of Silesia by Frederick the Great was more than a severe blow to the pride of Maria Theresa; for, since it was inhabited by Germans, its loss lessened the German element in the Hapsburg empire. In extent of territory the Hapsburgs more than made up for the loss by the partitions of Poland, but since the Poles were an alien race they added one more difficulty to the very difficult problem of ruling so many various peoples, each of whom had a

different language and different customs and institutions. The Hapsburg possessions were inhabited by Germans in Austria proper, a Slav people (the Czechs) mixed with Germans in Bohemia and Moravia, Poles in Galicia, Hungarians (or Magyars) along with Rumanians and smaller groups of other peoples in Hungary, Croats and Slovenes (both Slavs) in the south, Italians in Milan and Tuscany, and Flemish and Walloons in the Netherlands.

The problems which confronted Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II were much more difficult than those of France or England. Poles, Italians, Magyars, and Germans could never be united into one state by such common interests as Englishmen or Frenchmen have felt so keenly in the last two centuries. Instead of fusing together to form a nation, the peoples ruled over by the Hapsburgs were on such bad terms with each other that with the terrible disasters of the World War they finally split apart, forming separate nations. Moreover, since some of its peoples, especially the Slavs, Poles, and Rumanians, lived in neighboring states as well, the Hapsburg monarchy was always much concerned in what happened outside its borders. The immediate cause of the terrible conflict which began in 1914 was trouble between Austria and her neighbor Serbia. So if one hopes to understand the great questions of our own time he must follow carefully the complicated history of Austria and her ever-changing realms.

### QUESTIONS

I. Mention as many Slavic peoples as you can. What were the effects of the Tartar invasions on Russia?

II. Describe your impressions of Peter the Great. What were his aims? What lands did he add to Russia?

III. How did the early Hohenzollerns build up their state? When did they gain Prussia and why did they assume the title of King in Prussia? What was the policy of Frederick William I?

IV. Describe Frederick the Great's first war. What impressions have you of Frederick's character and tastes? Describe Frederick's part in the Seven Years' War.

V. What were the conditions in Poland in the eighteenth century? Describe the First Partition. Who was Kosciusko? How did Poland

disappear from the map of Europe? Have you heard anything of Poland lately?

VI. What were the possessions ruled over by the Hapsburgs? Describe the advance of the Turks. Why did the Hapsburgs always have particular difficulty in keeping their possessions together?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) Peter the Great, pp. 57-63; (2) the education of Frederick II, pp. 64-67; (3) diplomatic intrigues of Frederick II, pp. 68-70, 72-73; (4) Frederick's appeal to his soldiers, pp. 80-81; (5) excuses for the partition of Poland, pp. 82-89.


**Supplementary.** Consult any good encyclopedia, such as the *Britannica*, *Americana*, or *New International*, under the following headings: Frederick II (of Prussia), Peter I (the Great, of Russia), Charles XII (of Sweden), Maria Theresa, T. Kosciusko, Russia (early history), and Prussia (early history).

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the rise of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, pp. 347-352; (2) the struggle between the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, pp. 354-362; (3) Peter the Great and Charles XII, pp. 369-379; (4) Catherine the Great and the partition of Poland, pp. 379-388.

Draw a map showing the three partitions of Poland, based on BISHOP and ROBINSON, *Practical Map Exercises in Medieval and Modern European History*.







# INDIA about 1763

0 100 200 800  
Scale of Miles

- English Possessions
- French Possessions
- Portuguese Possessions
- Native States

## CHAPTER III

### THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN INDIA AND NORTH AMERICA

#### I. HOW EUROPE BEGAN TO EXTEND ITS COMMERCE OVER THE WHOLE WORLD

##### 64. World Commerce a New Factor in European History.

The long and desolating wars which we have just reviewed were nothing new in the history of the Old World. They grew out of the ambitions of princes and rulers, which had kept Europe in turmoil since the break-up of the Roman Empire. But running through them all was a new force, the strife of the commercial nations on the Atlantic—Spain, Portugal, France, Holland, and England—for the trade and territory of India and the New World. As English kings had once waged war on France to wrest from her the province of Anjou or Brittany (Vol. I, §§ 549–551), so now the English Parliament voted funds for armies to drive the French from the banks of the Ganges or the St. Lawrence and even sent money to Frederick the Great to help him in his war and thus keep the French armies busy while the British won Canada. The fate of Europe was no longer decided in Europe alone. A shot in the wilds of Pennsylvania might set in motion the armies of Austria and Prussia.

65. Rivalry of Business. To the jealousies of princes were added the rivalry of merchants and manufacturers ever alert and active in their search for business, and the builders of empire ever keen to bring more territory under their flags. With the progress of time all this became more and more important. The markets of India, America, and China called into being the great manufacturing towns of England—Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds—and as their business grew they in turn demanded more markets. If France or Holland threatened to cut into this trade,

the prosperity of rich and powerful classes was threatened. Whoever, therefore, would understand the last three centuries of European history must turn away from Europe itself and examine the course of events in the uttermost parts of the earth.

**66. Vast Extent of the European Colonial Dominion.** The great European ports, like Liverpool, Amsterdam, Hamburg, and Trieste, with their long lines of docks and warehouses and their fleets of merchant vessels, would dwindle away if their trade were confined to the demands of their European neighbors. Europe includes scarcely a twelfth of the land upon the globe, and yet over three fifths of the world is to-day either occupied by peoples of European origin or ruled by European states. The possessions of France in Asia and Africa exceed the entire area of Europe; even the little kingdom of the Netherlands administers a colonial dominion three times the size of Germany. The British Empire, of which the island of Great Britain is but a hundredth part, includes one fifth of the world's dry land. Moreover, European peoples have populated the United States (which is nearly as large as all of Europe), and colonized Mexico and South America.

The widening of the field of European history is one of the most striking features of modern times. Though the Greeks and Romans carried on a large trade in silks, spices, and precious stones with India and China, they really knew little of the world beyond southern Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia; and much that they knew was forgotten during the Middle Ages. Slowly, however, the interest in the East revived, and travelers began to add to the scanty knowledge handed down from antiquity.

**67. Colonial Policy of Portugal, Spain, and Holland.** The voyages which had brought America and India within the ken of Europe during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were mainly undertaken by the Portuguese and the Spaniards. Portugal was the first to realize the advantage of extending her commerce by establishing stations in India after Vasco da Gama rounded the Cape of Good Hope in 1497 (Vol. I, § 673), and later by founding posts on the Brazilian coast of South America; then Spain laid claim to Mexico, the West Indies, and a great part of





A FIGHT IN THE BRITISH CHANNEL BETWEEN THE OLD-FASHIONED  
WOODEN MEN-OF-WAR OF THE ENGLISH AND THE DUTCH





South America. These two powers later found an energetic rival in the Dutch, who succeeded in expelling the Portuguese from a number of their settlements in India and the Spice Islands and brought Java, Sumatra, and other tropical regions under Dutch control.

## II. CONTEST BETWEEN ENGLAND AND FRANCE FOR COLONIAL EMPIRE: INDIA

68. **The French and English in North America.** In North America the chief rivals were England and France, both of which succeeded in establishing colonies in the early part of the seventeenth century. Englishmen settled at Jamestown in Virginia (1607), then in New England, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere. The colonies owed their growth in part to the arrival of refugees,—Puritans, Catholics, and Quakers,—who left their European homes hoping to gain the right freely to enjoy their special forms of religion. On the other hand, many came in order to better their fortunes in the New World, and thousands of bond servants and slaves were brought over as laborers.

Just as Jamestown was being founded by the English, the French were making their first successful settlement in Nova Scotia and at Quebec. Although England made no attempt to oppose it, the French occupation of Canada progressed very slowly. In 1673 Marquette, a Jesuit missionary, and Joliet, a merchant, explored a part of the Mississippi River. La Salle sailed down the great stream and named the new country which he entered, Louisiana, after his king, Louis XIV. The city of New Orleans was founded, near the mouth of the river, in 1718, and the French established a chain of forts between it and Montreal.

The contest between England and France for the supremacy in North America was responsible for almost continuous border war, which burst out more fiercely with each war in the Old World. Finally, England was able, by the Treaty of Utrecht, to establish herself in the northern regions, for France thereby ceded to her Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and the borders of Hudson

Bay (§ 23). While the English in North America at the beginning of the Seven Years' War numbered over a million, the French did not reach a hundred thousand.

**69. Extent of India.** The rivalry of England and France was not confined to the wildernesses of North America, occupied by half a million of savage red men. At the opening of the eighteenth century both countries had gained a firm foothold on the borders of the vast Indian empire, inhabited by two hundred millions of people and the seat of an ancient and highly developed civilization. One may gain some idea of the extent of India by laying the map of Hindustan upon that of the United States. If the southernmost point, Cape Comorin, be placed over New Orleans, Calcutta will lie nearly over New York City, and Bombay in the neighborhood of Des Moines, Iowa.

**70. The Mongolian Emperors of Hindustan.** A generation after Vasco da Gama rounded the Cape, a Mongolian conqueror, Baber, had established his empire in India. The dynasty of Mongolian rulers which he founded was able to keep the whole country under their control for nearly two centuries; then after the death of the Great Mogul Aurungzeb, in 1707, their empire began to fall apart in much the same way as that of Charlemagne had done (Vol. I, §§ 517-518). Like the counts and dukes of the Carolingian period, the emperor's officials, the subahdars and nawabs (nabobs), and the rajahs (Hindu princes who had been subjugated by the Mongols) had gradually got the power in their respective districts into their own hands. Although the emperor, or Great Mogul, as the English called him, continued to maintain himself in his capital of Delhi, he could no longer be said to rule the country at the opening of the eighteenth century, when the French and English were beginning to turn their attention seriously to his coasts.

**71. English and French Settlements in India.** In the days of Charles I (1639) a village had been purchased by the English East India Company on the southeastern coast of Hindustan, which grew into the important English station of Madras. About the same time posts were established in the district of Bengal, and later Calcutta

was fortified. Bombay was already an English station. The Mongolian emperor of India at first scarcely deigned to notice the presence of a few foreigners on the fringe of his vast realms, but before the end of the seventeenth century hostilities began between the English East India Company and the native rulers, which made it plain that the British would be forced to defend themselves.




FIG. 7. THE TAJ MAHAL

This mausoleum of a princess was built at Agra, India, in 1632. It has been described as "the most splendidly poetic building in the world . . . a dream in marble, which justifies the saying that the Moguls designed like Titans but finished like jewelers." The entire building is of white marble, inlaid with precious stones. Although this is regarded as the most perfect monument, India has many others of great magnificence, witnesses of the power and wealth of her princes

The English had to face not only the opposition of the natives but that of a European power as well. France also had an East India Company, and at the opening of the eighteenth century Pondicherry was its chief center, with a population of sixty thousand, of which two hundred only were Europeans. It soon became apparent that there was little danger from the Great Mogul; moreover, the Portuguese and Dutch were out of the race, so the



native princes and the French and English were left to fight among themselves for the supremacy.

**72. England Victorious in the Struggle in America (1756-1763).** Just before the clash of European rulers known as the Seven Years' War came, in 1756 (§ 51), the French and English had begun their struggle in both America and India. In America the so-called French and Indian War began in 1754 between the English and French colonists. General Braddock was sent from England to capture Fort Duquesne, which the French had established to keep their rivals out of the Ohio valley. Braddock knew nothing of border warfare, and he was killed and his troops routed. Fortunately for England, France, as the ally of Austria, was soon engaged in a war with Prussia that prevented her from giving proper attention to her American possessions. A famous statesman, the elder Pitt, was now at the head of the English ministry. He was able not only to supply the hard-pressed king of Prussia with money and men but also to support the militia of the thirteen American colonies in their attacks upon the French. The French forts at Ticonderoga and Niagara were taken, Quebec was won in Wolfe's heroic attack (1759), and the next year all Canada submitted to the English. England's supremacy on the sea was demonstrated by three admirals, each of whom destroyed a French fleet.

**73. Dupleix and Clive in India.** In India conflicts between the French and the English had occurred during the War of the Austrian Succession. The governor of the French station of Pondicherry was Dupleix, a soldier of great energy, who proposed to drive out the English and firmly establish the power of France over Hindustan. His chances of success were greatly increased by the quarrels among the native rulers, some of whom belonged to the earlier Hindu inhabitants and some to the Mohammedan Mongolians who had conquered India in 1526. Dupleix had very few French soldiers, but he began the enlistment of the natives, a custom eagerly adopted by the English. These native soldiers, whom the English called Sepoys, were taught to fight in the manner of Europeans.

**74. Clive renders English Influence Supreme in India.** But the English colonists, in spite of the fact that they were mainly traders, discovered among the clerks in Madras a leader equal in military skill and energy to Dupleix himself. Robert Clive, who was but twenty-five years old at this time, organized a large force of Sepoys and gained a remarkable control over them by his astonishing bravery.

At the moment that the Seven Years' War was beginning, bad news reached Clive from the English settlement of Calcutta, about a thousand miles to the northeast of Madras. The nawab of Bengal had seized the property of some English merchants and imprisoned one hundred and forty-five Englishmen in a little room,—the "black hole" of Calcutta,—where most of them died of suffocation before morning. Clive hastened to Bengal, and with a little army of nine hundred Europeans and fifteen hundred Sepoys he gained a great victory at Plassey, in 1757, over the nawab's army of fifty thousand men. Clive then replaced the nawab of Bengal by a man whom he believed to be friendly to the English. Before the Seven Years' War was over, the English had won Pondicherry and deprived the French of all their former influence in the region of Madras.

**75. England's Gains in the Seven Years' War.** When the Seven Years' War was brought to an end, in 1763, by the Treaty of Paris, it was clear that England had gained far more than any other power. She was to retain her two forts commanding the Mediterranean—Gibraltar, and Port Mahon on the island of Minorca; in America, France ceded to her the vast region of Canada and Nova Scotia, as well as several of the islands in the West Indies. The region beyond the Mississippi was ceded to Spain by France, who thus gave up all her claims to North America. In India, France, it is true, received back the towns which the English had taken from her, but she had permanently lost her influence over the native rulers, for Clive had made the English name greatly feared among them.

## III. REVOLT OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES FROM ENGLAND

**76. England long left her Colonies very Free.** England had, however, no sooner added Canada to her possessions and driven the French from the broad region which lay between her dominions and the Mississippi than she lost the better part of her American empire by the revolt of the irritated colonists, who refused to submit to her interference in their government and commerce.

The English settlers had been left alone, for the most part, by the home government and had enjoyed *far greater freedom* in the management of their affairs than had the French and Spanish colonists. Virginia established its own assembly in 1619, and Massachusetts became almost an independent commonwealth. Schemes of self-government developed, which were later used as the basis for the constitutions of the several states when the colonies gained their independence. By the end of the Seven Years' War (1763) the colonists numbered over two millions. Their rapidly increasing wealth and strength, their free life in a new land, the confidence they had gained in their successful conflict with the French,—all combined to render interference of the home government intolerable to them.

**77. Navigation Laws.** England had, like Spain, France, and other colonizing countries, enacted a number of navigation and trade laws by which she tried to keep all the benefits of colonial trade and industry to herself. The early navigation laws passed under Cromwell and Charles II were specially directed against the enterprising Dutch traders. They provided that all products grown or manufactured in Asia, Africa, or America should be imported into England or her colonies only in English ships. Thus if a Dutch merchant vessel laden with cloves, cinnamon, teas, and silks from the Far East anchored in the harbor of New York, the inhabitants could not lawfully buy of the ship's master, no matter how much lower his prices were than those offered by English shippers. Furthermore, another act provided that no goods which were produced or manufactured in Europe should be imported into any of the colonies without being sent first to England and





**ENGLAND  
FRANCE AND SPAIN  
IN AMERICA  
1750**

0 100 200 300 400 500 1000  
Scale of Miles

THE M.-N. WORKS

PERU





carried in ships built in England or the colonies. So if a colonial merchant wished to buy French wines or Dutch watches, he would have to order through English merchants. Again, if a colonist desired to sell to a European merchant such products as the law permitted him to sell to foreigners, he had to export them in English ships and even send them by way of England.

**78. Trade Laws.** Certain articles in which the colonists were interested, such as sugar, tobacco, cotton, and indigo, could be sold only in England. Other things they were forbidden to export at all, or even to produce. For instance, though they possessed the finest furs in abundance, they could not export any caps or hats to England or to any foreign country. The colonists had built up a profitable lumber and provision trade with the French West Indies, from which they imported large quantities of rum, sugar, and molasses; but in order to keep this trade within British dominions the importation of these articles was forbidden.

**79. The Colonists neglect the English Restrictions.** The colonists naturally disregarded these laws as far as possible; they carried on a flourishing smuggling trade and built up industries in spite of them. Tobacco, sugar, hemp, flax, and cotton were grown and cloth was manufactured. Furnaces, foundries, nail and wire mills supplied pig and bar iron, chains, anchors, and other hardware. It is clear that where so many people were interested in both manufacturing and commerce a loud protest was sure to be raised against any attempts of England to restrict the business of the colonists in favor of her own merchants.

But previous to 1763 the navigation and trade laws had been loosely enforced, and business men of high standing ventured to neglect them and engage in illegal trade, which from the standpoint of the mother country constituted "smuggling." English statesmen had been busy during the previous century with the great struggle at home and with the wars stirred up by Louis XIV. After the Peace of Utrecht the prime minister, Walpole, for twenty years prudently refused to interfere with the independence of the colonies. Moreover, the colonists enjoyed the protection of the British navy and certain advantages in British markets.

**80. Change in English Colonial Policy after 1763.** With the close of the successful Seven Years' War, and the conquest of Canada and the Ohio valley, arrangements had to be made to protect the new territories and meet the expenses resulting from the great enlargement of the British Empire. The home government naturally argued that the prosperous colonists ought to help pay the debt incurred in the late war and contribute toward the upkeep of a small body of troops for guarding the new possessions.

**81. The Stamp Act.** This led to the passage of the Stamp Act, which taxed the colonists by requiring them to pay the English government for the stamps which had to be used on leases, deeds, and other legal documents in order to make them binding. This act stirred up the leaders among the colonists, like Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry, who declared that they had already borne the brunt of the recent war and that Parliament had no right to tax them since they were not represented directly in that body. Such representation, they said, was impossible, because England was so far away. Therefore, so ran their argument, the American colonists could be taxed only by their own assemblies. Whatever may have been the merits of their arguments, representatives of the colonies met in New York in 1765 and denounced the Stamp Act as indicating "a manifest tendency to subvert the rights and liberties of the colonists."

The unpopular stamp tax was repealed, in spite of the views of King George III, who, with some of the Tory party in Parliament, thought that the colonists should be punished rather than conciliated. Many of the Whigs were very friendly to them, and a proposal was made that the colonists tax themselves to help the British treasury, but Benjamin Franklin, then in England, sadly admitted that they would not do so. Parliament then decided to raise a certain amount by duties on glass, paper, and tea, and a board was established to secure a stricter enforcement of the old and hitherto largely neglected navigation laws and other restrictions. The protests of the colonists had their effect, however, on the English statesmen and led Parliament to remove all the

duties except that on tea. This was retained owing to the active efforts of the East India Company, whose interests were at stake.

**82. The Boston Tea Party (1773); Attitude of Parliament toward the Colonists.** The effort to make the Americans pay a very moderate duty on tea and to force upon the Boston markets the Company's tea at a very low price produced trouble in 1773. Those who had supplies of smuggled tea to dispose of and who were likely to be undersold, even after the small duty which had been imposed was paid, raised a new cry of illegal taxation, and a band of young men was got together in Boston who boarded a tea ship in the harbor and threw the cargo into the water. This so-called Boston Tea Party increased the disagreement between the colonies and the mother country.

A considerable body in Parliament were opposed to coercing the colonists. Burke, perhaps the most able member of the House of Commons, urged the ministry to leave the Americans free to tax themselves, but George III and the majority of the Parliament could not forgive the colonists for their opposition. They believed that the trouble was largely confined to New England and could easily be overcome. In 1774 acts were passed prohibiting the landing and shipping of goods at Boston; and the colony of Massachusetts was deprived of its former right to choose its judges and the members of the upper house of its legislature, who were thereafter to be selected by the king.

**83. The Continental Congresses.** These measures, instead of bringing Massachusetts to terms, so roused the apprehension of the rest of the colonists that a congress of representatives from all the colonies was held at Philadelphia in 1774 to see what could be done. This congress decided that all trade with Great Britain should cease until the complaints of the colonies had been satisfied. The following year the Americans collided with the British troops at Lexington and made a brave stand against them in the battle of Bunker Hill. The second congress decided to prepare for war and raised an army, which was put under the command of George Washington, a Virginia planter who had gained distinction in the late French and Indian War.



**84. Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776).** Up to this time few people had openly advocated the separation of the colonies from the mother country, but the proposed compromises came to nothing, and in July, 1776, Congress declared that "these United States are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

The party that favored independence was at first certainly a minority of the population. The so-called "Tories" who opposed separation from England were perhaps as numerous as the "patriots" who advocated the American Revolution, and at least one third of the colonists appear to have been indifferent.

**85. The United States receives Aid from France.** The Declaration of Independence naturally excited great interest in France. The outcome of the Seven Years' War had been most lamentable for that country, and any trouble which came to her old enemy, England, could not but be a source of congratulation to the French. The United States therefore regarded France as a natural ally and immediately sent Benjamin Franklin to Versailles in the hope of obtaining the aid of the new French king, Louis XVI. The king's ministers were uncertain whether the colonies could long maintain their resistance against the overwhelming strength of the mother country. It was only after the Americans had defeated Burgoyne at Saratoga that France, in 1778, concluded a treaty with the United States in which the independence of the new republic was recognized. This was equivalent to declaring war upon England. The French government aided the colonies with loans; and enthusiasm for the Americans was so great in France that a number of the younger nobles, the most conspicuous of whom was the Marquis of Lafayette, crossed the Atlantic to fight as volunteers in the American army.

**86. Success of the Revolution.** There was so much difference of opinion in England in regard to the expediency of the war and so much sympathy in Parliament for the colonists that the military operations were not carried on with much vigor. Nevertheless the Americans found it no easy task to win the war. In spite of the skill and heroic self-sacrifice of Washington, they lost more battles than they gained. It is extremely doubtful whether

they would have succeeded in bringing the war to a favorable close, by forcing the English general, Cornwallis, to capitulate at Yorktown (1781), had it not been for the aid of the French fleet. The chief result of the war was the recognition by England of the independence of the United States, whose territory was to extend to the Mississippi River. To the west of the Mississippi the vast territory of Louisiana still remained in the hands of Spain, as well as Florida, which England had held since 1763 but now gave back.

Spain and Portugal were able to hold their American possessions a generation longer than the English, but in the end practically all of the Western Hemisphere, with the exception of Canada, completely freed itself from the domination of the European powers. Cuba, one of the very last vestiges of Spanish rule in the West, gained its independence with the aid of the United States in 1898.

**87. The New Order in America.** While casting off British rule, the Americans established governments of their own. Rhode Island and Connecticut slightly changed the charters they had received from the king and went on their way as free states. In each of the other states a new written constitution was adopted. A loose union was then formed under the Articles of Confederation duly proclaimed in 1781. Finding the Articles unsatisfactory in many ways, the Americans drafted a new plan of union—the Constitution of the United States—which went into effect in 1789 with the inauguration of Washington as president.

**88. American Influence in Europe.** The example of a people forming a government without kings and hereditary aristocracies was highly instructive to the nations of Europe. French noblemen, like Lafayette, who had served in the American army, took back with them marvelous stories of the great republican experiment. **O**ur state constitutions were translated into French and widely circulated in Europe. The Declaration of Independence was a clarion call to the oppressed of the earth. Frenchmen who opposed the absolutism of the Bourbons, and Englishmen who demanded for all men the right to vote for members of the House of Commons, took courage from the American achievement.

Farsighted diplomats knew that European countries must henceforth reckon with the new republic beyond the seas. Thus by its spirit, its system of government, and its power, America became a great force in the arena of world affairs.

### QUESTIONS

I. Why must we study the European colonies in order to understand European history? What countries preceded England in acquiring colonies? Give the possessions of Spain, England, and France in North America previous to the Seven Years' War.

II. Tell something of the extent and population of India. How did England get its first foothold in India? Where were the French settlements? What was the result of the French and Indian War in America? in India? Enumerate England's colonial possessions at the end of the war.

III. Describe England's navigation and trade laws. Give the chief events leading to the revolt of England's colonies in America. Were the English unanimously in favor of coercing the American colonies? Why did France favor the colonies? What were the chief results of the American Revolution?

### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) how England gained a foothold in India, pp. 95-97; (2) rivalry among the Europeans in India, pp. 92-95, 97-101; (3) the state of affairs in India, pp. 101-105; (4) the collision between the English and the natives, pp. 104-110; (5) Marquette's journey down the Mississippi, pp. 116-121; (6) John Smith's account of the landing in Virginia, pp. 121-122; (7) Bradford's account of the landing of the Pilgrims, pp. 122-124; (8) Braddock's defeat and the capture of Quebec, pp. 126-130; (9) the Boston Tea Party, pp. 130-132; (10) the stubbornness of George III, pp. 133-135.

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) French and English colonies in the seventeenth century, pp. 299-306; (2) early conflict between France and England, pp. 306-312; (3) the triumph of Great Britain (1756-1763), pp. 312-319; (4) British colonial system, pp. 322-331; (5) the American Revolution, pp. 332-337.

## BOOK II. CONDITIONS AND REFORMS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

### CHAPTER IV

#### LIFE OF THE PEOPLE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: NOBILITY AND CLERGY

##### I. LIFE IN THE COUNTRY—SERFDOM

89. **Medieval Survivals in the Eighteenth Century.** If a peasant who had lived on a manor in the time of the Crusades had been permitted to return to earth and travel about Europe at the opening of the eighteenth century, he would have found much to remind him of the conditions under which, seven centuries earlier, he had extracted a scanty living from the soil. It is true that the gradual extinction of serfdom (see Vol. I, §§ 526, 573) in western Europe appears to have begun as early as the twelfth century, but it proceeded at very different rates in different countries. In France the old type of serf had largely disappeared by the fourteenth century, and in England a hundred years later. In Prussia, Austria, Poland, Russia, Italy, and Spain, on the contrary, the great mass of the country people were still bound to the soil in the eighteenth century.

90. **The Peasants of France and England.** Even in France there were still many traces of the old system. The peasant was, it is true, no longer bound to a particular manor; he could buy or sell his land at will, could marry without consulting the lord, and could go and come as he pleased. Many bought their land outright, while others disposed of their holdings and settled in town. But the lord might still require all those on his manor to grind their grain at his mill, bake their bread in his oven, and



press their grapes in his wine press. The peasant might have to pay a toll to cross a bridge or ferry which was under the lord's control, or a certain sum for driving his flock past the lord's mansion. Many of the old arrangements still forced the peasant occupying a particular plot of land to turn over to the lord a certain portion of his crops, and if he sold his land, to pay the lord a part of the money he received for it.

In England in the eighteenth century the prominent features of serfdom had disappeared more completely than in France. The services in labor due to the lord had long been changed into money payments, and the peasant was thus transformed into a renter or owner of his holding. He still took off his hat to the squire of his village, and was liable to be severely punished by his lord, who was commonly a justice of the peace, if he was caught shooting a hare on the game preserves.

**91. Serfdom in Other Parts of Europe.** In central, southern, and eastern Europe the medieval system still prevailed; the peasant lived and died upon the same manor, and worked for his lord in the same way that his ancestors had worked a thousand years before. Everywhere the same crude agricultural instruments were still used, and most of the implements and tools were rudely made in the village itself. The wooden plows commonly found even on English farms were constructed on the model of the old Roman plow; wheat was cut with a sickle, grass with an unwieldy scythe, and the rickety cart wheels were supplied only with wooden rims.

**92. The Life of the Peasant.** The houses occupied by the people differed greatly from Sicily to Pomerania and from Ireland to Poland; but, in general, they were small, with little light or ventilation, and often they were nothing but wretched hovels with dirt floors and neglected thatch roofs. The pigs and the cows were frequently better housed than the people, with whom they associated upon very familiar terms, since the barn and the house were commonly in the same building. The drinking water was bad, and there was no attempt to secure proper drainage. Fortunately everyone was out of doors a great deal of the time, for the




FIG. 8. LONDON IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

London was almost destroyed by a great fire in 1666. The old city had been a picturesque mass of timbered houses; the new one was built of brick and stone. In the center rose the new St. Paul's Cathedral, whose dome, 370 feet high, is still higher than any other building in the city. Its architect, Sir Christopher Wren, also built most of the churches whose spires are visible here, the eighteenth-century artist having drawn them, indeed, somewhat out of proportion in order to attract attention to them. The column with a gallery around it is "The Monument," erected to commemorate the great fire. At the lower right-hand side is the Tower. Note the houses on London Bridge. The two towers farthest up the river are those of Westminster Abbey

*Arthur Young 1789 - travels -  
good budget - beautiful views*

women as well as the men usually worked in the fields, cultivating the soil and helping to gather in the crops.

**93. Unattractive Character of Country Life.** Country life in the eighteenth century was obviously very arduous and unattractive for the most part. The peasant had no newspapers to tell him of the world outside his manor, nor could he have read them if he had had them. Even in England not one farmer in five thousand, it is said, could read at all, and in France the local tax collectors were too uneducated to make out their own reports. Farther east conditions must have been still more cheerless, for a Hungarian peasant complained that he owed four days of his labor to his lord, spent the fifth and sixth hunting and fishing for him, while the seventh belonged to God.

## II. THE TOWNS AND THE GUILDS

**94. The Conditions of the Towns.** Even in the towns there was much to remind one of the Middle Ages. The narrow, crooked streets, darkened by the overhanging buildings and scarcely lighted at all by night, the rough cobblestones, the disgusting odors even in the best quarters—all offered a marked contrast to the European cities of to-day, which have grown tremendously in the last hundred years in size, beauty, and comfort.

**95. London in the Eighteenth Century.** In 1760 London had half a million inhabitants, or about a tenth of its present population. There were of course no street cars or omnibuses, to say nothing of the thousands of automobiles which now thread their way in and out through the press of traffic. A few hundred hackney coaches and sedan chairs served to carry those who had not private conveyances and could not, or would not, walk. The ill-lighted streets were guarded at night by watchmen, who went about with lanterns but afforded so little protection against the roughs and robbers that gentlemen were compelled to carry arms when passing through the streets after nightfall.

**96. Paris in the Eighteenth Century.** Paris was somewhat larger than London and had outgrown its medieval walls. The



police were more efficient there, and the highway robberies which disgraced London and its suburbs were almost unknown. The great park, the "Elysian fields," and many boulevards which now form so distinguished a feature of Paris were already laid out; but, in general, the streets were still narrow, and there were none of the fine broad avenues which now radiate from a hundred centers. There were few sewers to carry off the water which, when it rained, flowed through the middle of the streets. The filth of former times still remained, and the people relied upon easily polluted wells or the dirty River Seine for their water supply.

**97. German Towns.** In Germany very few of the towns had spread beyond their medieval walls. They had, for the most part, lost their former prosperity, which was still attested by the fine houses of the merchants and of the once flourishing guilds. Berlin had a population of only about two hundred thousand. Vienna, in Austria, was slightly larger. This city then employed from thirty to a hundred street cleaners and boasted that the street lamps were lighted every night, while many towns contented themselves with dirty streets and with light during the winter months, and then only when the moon was not scheduled to shine.



FIG. 9. STREET OF A TOWN IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The streets were still narrow, though wider than in medieval cities, for there were no longer walls to inclose them. But the houses often had projecting gables with heavy beams like those in this quaint French town of Honfleur



98. **Italian Cities.** Even the famous cities of Italy,—Milan, Genoa, Florence, Rome,—notwithstanding their beautiful palaces and public buildings, were, with the exception of water-bound Venice, crowded into the narrow compass of the town wall, and their streets were narrow and crooked.

99. **Small-Scale Industries and the Guilds.** Another contrast between the towns of the eighteenth century and those of to-day



FIG. 10. PUBLIC LETTER WRITER

lay in the absence of the great wholesale warehouses, the vast factories with their tall chimneys, and the attractive department stores which may now be found in every city from Dublin to Budapest. Commerce and industry were in general conducted upon a very small scale, except at the great ports like London, Antwerp, or Amsterdam, where goods coming from and going to the colonies were brought together.

A great part of the manufacturing still took place in little shops, where the articles when completed were offered for sale. Generally those who owned the various shops carrying on a particular trade, such as tailoring, shoemaking, baking, tanning, bookbinding, hair-cutting, or the making of candles, knives, hats, artificial flowers, swords, or wigs, had been, since the Middle Ages, organized into a guild—a union—the main object of which was to prevent all other citizens from making or selling the articles in which the members of the guild dealt.

The number of master workmen who might open a shop of their own was often limited by the guild, as well as the number of




FIG. I. I. A MERCHANT IN HIS SHOP IN THE OLD RÉGIME

Most of the shops of the eighteenth century were just rooms of private houses fitted up for business. Outside was a sign depicting, for the benefit of those who could not read, what was for sale





apprentices each master could train. The period of apprenticeship was long, sometimes seven or even nine years, on the ground that it took years to learn the trade properly, but really because the guild wished to maintain its monopoly by keeping down the number who could become masters. When the apprenticeship was over, the workman became a journeyman, but unless he had influential friends he might perhaps never become a master workman and open a shop of his own.

**100. How the Guilds maintained their Monopolies.** The guilds not only protected themselves against workmen who opened shops without their permission, but each particular trade was in more or less constant disagreement with the other trades as to what each might make. Everywhere a workman had to stick to his trade; if a cobbler should venture to make a pair of new boots, or a baker should roast a piece of meat in his oven, he might be expelled from the guild unless he made amends. In Paris a hatter, who had greatly increased his trade by making hats of wool mixed with silk, had his stock destroyed by the guild authorities on the ground that the rules permitted hats to be made only of wool, and said nothing of silk. The trimming makers had an edict passed forbidding anyone to make buttons that were cast or turned or made of horn. Those who dealt in natural flowers were not allowed to encroach upon those who made artificial ones. The tailor who mended clothes must not make new garments. Such regulations were naturally too strict to be rigorously enforced, but they hampered industry.

**101. Guilds compared to Trade Unions.** The guilds differed from the modern trade-unions in several important respects. In the first place, it was only the master workmen, who owned the shops, tools, or machines, who belonged to them. The apprentices and journeymen, that is, the ordinary workmen, were excluded and had no part whatever in the management of the organization. In the second place, the government enforced the decisions of the guilds. For example, in Paris, if it was learned that a journeyman goldbeater was working for himself, a representative of the guild went to the offender's house, accompanied by a town officer, and



seized his tools and materials, after which the unfortunate man might be sent to the galleys for three years or perhaps get off with a heavy fine, imprisonment, and the loss of every chance of ever becoming a master. Lastly, the guilds were confined to the old-established industries, which were still carried on, as during the Middle Ages, on a small scale in the master's house.

**102. Decline of the Guilds.** In spite, however, of the seeming strength of the guilds, they were really giving way before the entirely new conditions which had arisen. In many towns the regulations were evaded or had broken down altogether, so that enterprising workmen and dealers carried on their business as they pleased. Then, as we have said, it was only the old industries that were included in the guild system. The newer manufactures, of silk and cotton goods, porcelain, fine glassware, etc., which had been introduced into Europe, were under the control of individuals or companies who were independent of the old guilds and relied upon monopolies and privileges granted by the rulers, who, in France at least, were glad to foster new industries.

Meanwhile, as we shall see later (Chapter XII), the progress of invention was preparing the new age of machinery and factories, which was to change the whole nature of industry and bring the modern problems of employer and workman, or capital and labor.

### III. THE NOBILITY AND THE MONARCHY

**103. The General Decline in the Independence of the Nobility.** Not only had the medieval manor and the medieval guilds maintained themselves down into the eighteenth century but the successors of the feudal lords continued to exist as a conspicuous and powerful class. They enjoyed various privileges and distinctions denied to the ordinary citizen, although they were, of course, shorn of the great power that the more important dukes and counts had enjoyed in the Middle Ages, when they ruled over vast tracts, could summon their vassals to assist them in their constant wars with their neighbors, and dared defy even the authority of the king himself.

It is impossible to recount here how the English, French, and Spanish kings gradually subdued the warlike barons and brought the great fiefs directly under royal control. Suffice it to say that the monarchs met with such success that by the eighteenth century the nobles were completely subjugated. Those whose predecessors had once been actual sovereigns within their own domains, had declared war even against the king, coined money, made laws for their subjects, and meted out justice in their castle halls, had, by the eighteenth century, deserted their war horses and laid aside their long swords; in their velvet coats and high-heeled shoes they were contented with the privilege of helping the king to dress in the morning and attending him at dinner. The battlemented castle, once the stronghold of independent chieftains, was transformed into a tasteful country residence where, if the king honored the owner with a visit, the host was no longer tempted, as his ancestors had been, to shower arrows and stones upon the royal intruder.

**104. The Peculiar Position of the French Nobility.** The French noble, unlike the English, was not fond of the country, but lived with the court at Versailles whenever he could afford to do so, and often when he could not. He liked the excitement of the court, and it was there that he could best advance his own and his friends' interests by obtaining lucrative offices in the army or Church or in the king's palace. By their prolonged absence from their estates the nobles lost the esteem of their tenants, while their stewards roused the hatred of the peasants by strictly collecting all the ancient manorial dues (§ 90) in order that the lord might enjoy the gayeties at Versailles.

**105. The French Nobility a Privileged Class.** The unpopularity of the French nobility was further increased by their freedom from some of the heavy taxes, on the ground that they were still supposed to shed their blood in fighting for their king instead of paying him money like unsoldierly merchants and peasants. They enjoyed, moreover, the preference when the king had desirable positions to grant. They also claimed a certain social superiority, since they were excluded by their traditions of birth from engaging

in any ordinary trade or industry, although they might enter some professions, such as medicine, law, the Church, or the army, or even become interested in shipping without losing any of their dignity. In short, the French nobility, including, it is estimated, a hundred and thirty thousand or forty thousand persons, constituted a privileged class, although they no longer performed any of the high services which had been rendered by their predecessors.



FIG. 12. FRENCH CASTLE TRANSFORMED INTO A COUNTRY RESIDENCE

The round towers, covered with ivy, date from the Middle Ages. The rest has been rebuilt with pleasant sunny windows in place of loopholes in the walls. The terrace and lawn lying between the old drawbridge towers and the house once formed the castle courtyard

**106. The Ennobled.** To make matters worse, very few of the nobles really belonged to old feudal families. For the most part they had been *ennobled* by the king for some supposed service, or had bought an office, or a judgeship in the higher courts, to which noble rank was attached. Naturally this circumstance served to rob them of much of the respect that their hereditary dignity and titles might otherwise have gained for them.

**107. The English Nobility.** In England the feudal castles had disappeared earlier even than in France, and the English law did not grant to anyone, however long and distinguished his lineage, legal rights or privileges not enjoyed by every freeman.

Nevertheless there was a distinct noble class in England. The monarch had formerly been accustomed to summon his earls and some of his barons to take council with him, and in this way the *peerage* developed; this included those whose title permitted them to sit in the House of Lords and to transmit this honorable prerogative to their eldest sons. But the peers paid the same taxes as every other subject and were punished in the same manner if they were convicted of an offense. Moreover only the eldest surviving son of a noble father inherited his rank, while on the Continent all the children became nobles. In this way the number of the English nobility was greatly restricted, and their social distinction roused relatively little antagonism.

**108. The German Knights like Medieval Lords.** In Germany, however, the nobles continued to occupy very much the same position which their ancestors held in the Middle Ages. There had been no king to do for all Germany what the French kings had done for France; no mighty man had risen strong enough to batter down castle walls and bend all barons, great and small, to his will. The result was that there were in Germany in the eighteenth century hundreds of nobles dwelling in strong old castles and ruling with a high hand domains which were sometimes no larger than a big American farm. They levied taxes, held courts, coined money, and maintained standing armies of perhaps only a handful of soldiers.

**109. The King as Chief among the Nobles.** In all the countries of Europe the chief noble was of course the monarch himself, to whose favor almost all the lesser nobles owed their titles and rank. He was, except in a few cases, always despotic, granting the people no share in the management of the government and often rendering them miserable by needless wars and ill-advised and oppressive taxes. He commonly maintained a very expensive court and gave away to unworthy courtiers much of the money which he had wrung from his people. He was permitted to imprison his subjects upon the slightest grounds and in the most unjust manner; nevertheless he usually enjoyed their loyalty and respect, since they were generally ready to attribute his bad acts to evil councilors.

I goodness of human nature  
I divine right of democracy  
2 inherent equality of man.



110. **The Services performed by even Despotic Kings.** On the whole, the king merited much of the respect paid him. He it was who had destroyed the power of innumerable lesser despots and created something like a nation. He had put a stop to the private warfare and feudal brigandage which had disgraced the Middle Ages. His officers maintained order throughout the country so that merchants and travelers could go to and fro with little danger. He opened highroads for them and established a general system of coinage, which greatly assisted business transactions. He interested himself more and more in commerce and industry and often encouraged learning.

Finally, by consolidating his realms and establishing a regular system of government, the king prepared the way for the European State of to-day, in which either the people have secured control over lawmaking and national finances or, in many cases, the monarch has been discarded altogether as no longer needful. Democracy and general equality would, in fact, have been impossible if monarchs had not leveled the proud and mighty nobles who aspired to be petty kings in their domains. But still the monarchs preferred to associate with nobles at their courts, rather than with the great middle class which formed the mass of the nation.

#### IV. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

111. **The Church in the Middle Ages.** The eighteenth century had inherited from the Middle Ages the nobility with their peculiar privileges. At the same time the clergy, especially in Catholic countries, still possessed privileges which set them off from the nation at large. They were far more powerful and better organized than the nobility and exercised a great influence in the State. The clergy owed their authority to the Church, which for many centuries had been the great central institution of Europe.

It must be remembered that everyone in the Middle Ages had been required to belong to the Church, somewhat in the same way that we to-day all belong as a matter of course to the State. Before the Protestant revolt all the states of western Europe had formed

a single religious association, from which it was a crime to revolt. To refuse allegiance to the Church or to question its authority or teachings was considered treason against God, the most terrible of all crimes (see Vol. I, Chapter XXVIII).

The Church did not rely for its support, as churches must to-day, largely upon the personal contributions of its members, but enjoyed the revenue from vast domains which kings, nobles, and other landholders had from time to time given to the churches and monasteries. In addition to the income from its lands, the Church had the right, like the State, to impose a regular tax, which was called the *tithe*. All who were subject to this were forced to pay it, whether they cared anything about religion or not, just as we are all compelled to pay taxes imposed by the government under which we live.

**112. Great Powers still retained by the Catholic Church.** In spite of the changes which had overtaken the Church since the Middle Ages, it still retained its ancient external appearance in the eighteenth century—its gorgeous ceremonial, its wealth, its influence over the lives of men, its intolerance of those who ventured to differ from the conceptions of Christianity which it held. The Church could fine and imprison those whom it convicted of blasphemy, contempt of religion, or heresy. The clergy managed the schools, in which, of course, the children were brought up in the orthodox faith. Hospitals and other charitable institutions were under their control. They registered all births and deaths, and only the marriages which they sanctified were regarded by the State as legal. The monasteries still existed in great numbers and owned vast tracts of land. A map of Paris made in 1789 shows no less than sixty-eight monasteries and seventy-three nunneries within the walls. The tithe was still paid as in the Middle Ages, and the clergy still enjoyed exemption from the direct taxes.

**113. Intolerance of both Catholics and Protestants.** Judged by the standards of the twentieth century, both the Catholic and the Protestant churches were very intolerant, and in this were usually supported by the government, which was ready to punish or persecute those who refused to conform to the State religion,

whatever it might be, or ventured to speak or write against its doctrines. There was none of that religious freedom which is so general now, and which permits a man to worship or not as he pleases, to reject religion in any or all of its forms without danger of imprisonment, loss of citizenship, or death.

**114. Position of the Protestants in France.** In France, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, Protestants had lost <sup>bowst</sup> all civil rights. According to a decree of 1724 those who assembled for any form of worship other than the Roman Catholic were condemned to lose their property; the men were to be sent to the galleys and the women imprisoned for life. The preachers who convoked such assemblies or performed Protestant ceremonies were punishable with death; but only a few executions took place, for happily the old enthusiasm for persecution was abating. None the less, all who did not accept the Catholic teachings were practically outlawed, for the priests would neither recognize the marriages nor register the births and deaths over which they were not called to preside. This made it impossible for Protestants to marry legally and have legitimate children, or to inherit or bequeath property.

**115. Censorship of the Press.** Books and pamphlets were carefully examined in order to see whether they contained any attacks upon the orthodox Catholic beliefs or might in any way serve to undermine the authority of the Church or of the king. The Pope had long maintained a commission (which still exists) to examine new books, and to publish from time to time a list, called the "Index," of all those which the Church condemned and forbade the faithful to read. The king of France, as late as 1757, issued a declaration establishing the death penalty for those who wrote, printed, or distributed any work which appeared to be an attack upon religion. The teachings of the professors in the university were watched. A considerable number of the books issued in France in the eighteenth century which ventured to criticize the government or the Church were condemned either by the clergy or the king's courts, and were burned by the common hangman or suppressed. Not infrequently the authors, if they could be discovered, were imprisoned.

Nevertheless books attacking the old ideas and suggesting reforms in Church and State constantly appeared and were freely circulated. The writers took care not to place their names or those of the publishers upon the title-pages, and many such books were printed at Geneva or in Holland, where great freedom prevailed. Many others which purported to be printed abroad were actually printed secretly at home.

**116. The Church in Southern and Central Europe.** In Spain, Austria, and Italy, however, and especially in the Papal States, the clergy, particularly the Jesuits, were more powerful and enjoyed more privileges than in France. In Spain the censorship of the press and the Inquisition formed a double protection against change until the latter half of the eighteenth century.

In Germany the position of the Church varied greatly. The southern states were Catholic, while Prussia and the north had embraced Protestantism. Many bishops and abbots ruled as princes over their own lands. Their estates covered almost a third of the map of western and southern Germany and were, of course, quite distinct from the religious divisions or dioceses.

## V. THE ENGLISH ESTABLISHED CHURCH AND THE PROTESTANT SECTS

**117. The Anglican Church.** In England Henry VIII had thrown off his allegiance to the Pope and declared himself the head of the English Church. Under his daughter, Queen Elizabeth (1558–1603), Parliament had established the Church of England. It abolished the mass and sanctioned the Book of Common Prayer, which has since remained the official guide to the services in the Anglican Church. The beliefs of the Church were brought together in the Thirty-Nine Articles, from which no one was to vary or depart. The system of government of the Roman Catholic Church, with its archbishops, bishops, and priests, was retained, but the appointment of bishops was put in the hands of the monarch or his ministers (see Vol. I, §§ 762, 797). Anyone who failed to attend services on Sunday and holy-days was to be fined.



**118. The Persecution of Catholics.** Those who persisted in clinging to the Roman Catholic belief fared badly, although happily there were no such general massacres as overwhelmed the Protestants in France. Under the influence of the Jesuits some of the English Catholics became involved in plots against the Protestant queen, Elizabeth, who had been deposed by the Pope. These were in some instances executed for treason. Indeed, anyone who brought a papal bull to England, who embraced Catholicism, or converted a Protestant was declared a traitor. Fines and imprisonment were inflicted upon those who dared to say or to hear mass.<sup>1</sup>

**119. The English Dissenters.** But there were many Protestants who did not approve of the Anglican Church as established by law. These were called "Dissenters," and they developed gradually into several sects with differing views. By far the most numerous of the Dissenters were the Baptists. They spread to America, and were the first Protestant sect to undertake foreign missions on a large scale, having founded a society for that purpose as early as 1792.

Another English sect which was destined also to be conspicuous in America was the Society of Friends, or Quakers, as they are commonly called. This group owes its origin to George Fox, who began his preaching in 1647. The Friends were distinguished by their simplicity of life and dress, their abhorrence of war, and their rejection of all ceremonial, including even the Lord's Supper. Their chief stronghold in America has always been Pennsylvania, more particularly Philadelphia and its neighborhood, where they settled under the leadership of William Penn.

The Quakers were the first religious sect to denounce war ever and always, and they should have much of the credit of beginning

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted here that the Catholics found a refuge in America from their Protestant persecutors, as did the Huguenots who fled from the oppression of the Catholic government in France. The colony of Maryland was founded by Lord Baltimore in 1634 and named after the French wife of Charles I. In the nineteenth century the number of Catholics in the United States was vastly increased by immigration from Ireland, Italy, and other countries, so that there are over thirteen millions to-day who have been baptized into the Roman Catholic Church.

the movement against war, which had gained much headway, as we shall see later, before the outbreak of the great world conflict in 1914.

**120. John Wesley and the Methodists.** The last of the great Protestant sects to appear was that of the Methodists. Their founder, John Wesley, when at Oxford had established a religious society among his fellow students. Their piety and the regularity of their habits gained for them the nickname of "Methodists." After leaving Oxford, Wesley spent some time in the colony of Georgia. On his return to England in 1738 he came to believe in the sudden and complete forgiveness of sins known as "conversion," which he later made the basis of his teaching. He began a series of great revival meetings in London and other large towns. He spent a great part




FIG. 13. JOHN WESLEY

of his time journeying up and down the land, aided in his preaching by his brother Charles and by the impassioned Whitefield.

Only gradually did the Methodists separate themselves from the Church of England, of which they at first considered themselves members. In 1784 the numerous American Methodists were formally organized into the Methodist Episcopal Church, and early in the nineteenth century the English Methodists became an independent organization. At the time of Wesley's death his followers numbered over fifty thousand, and there are now in the United States over six millions, including the various branches of the Church.

**121. Decline of Religious Persecution.** By the end of the seventeenth century the spirit of religious persecution had died down in England. To be sure, England had its State Church, but by the Act of Toleration of 1689 the Dissenters were permitted to hold services in their own way, even though they were excluded from government offices and could not obtain a degree at the universities unless they gave up their own faith.

Toward Roman Catholics the law remained as harsh as ever. Those who clung to the Roman Catholic faith, to the Pope and the mass, were forbidden to enter England. The celebration of the mass was strictly prohibited. All public offices were closed to Catholics, and of course they could not sit in Parliament. Indeed, legally, they had no right whatever to be in England at all. But, as in the case of the Dissenters, the laws were enforced less and less as time went on.

**122. Freedom of the Press in England.** The Church courts still existed in England and could punish laymen for not attending church, for heresy, and for certain immoral acts. But their powers were little exercised compared with the clergy on the Continent. Moreover one who published a book or pamphlet did not have to obtain the permission of the government as in France. Indeed, nowhere was there such unrestrained discussion of scientific and religious matters at this period as in England. England, in the early eighteenth century, was the center of progressive thought from which the French philosophers and reformers drew their inspiration.

### QUESTIONS

I. Who were the serfs? In what parts of Europe were they to be found in the eighteenth century? Describe the life of the peasants on a French estate.

II. Contrast the towns of the eighteenth century with those of to-day. Describe the guild system. What were the advantages and the disadvantages of the system? In what respects are the modern trade-unions unlike the guilds?

III. What privileges did a French noble enjoy in the old régime? How did one become a noble? Contrast the English nobility with the

French. What justification, if any, was there for the despotic rule of the kings of the old régime?

IV. In what ways did the Church of the Middle Ages differ from the Church, Catholic or Protestant, of modern times? How many of its medieval powers did the Roman Catholic Church retain in the seventeenth century? What was the "Index"? What examples are there of religious intolerance in France and England during the period just named?

V. What Church replaced the Roman Catholic Church in England after the Protestant revolt? Describe its system of government. Where may a statement of its beliefs be found? Mention the different religious sects (Dissenters) which appeared in England after the break with Rome. How has their influence been felt beyond England? In what ways did religious tolerance appear in England in the late seventeenth and the eighteenth century? Have we religious toleration in the United States?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) the condition of the country people, pp. 138-141; (2) the towns and the guilds, pp. 141-146; (3) the Catholic Church, pp. 148-152; (4) the Jesuit Order, pp. 152-160; (5) the English Established Church and the Protestant sects, pp. 160-171.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Feudalism, Guilds, Papacy, Huguenots, John Wesley, Methodism, Ignatius of Loyola, and Jesuits.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) agriculture in the eighteenth century, pp. 395-399; (2) commerce and industry in the eighteenth century, pp. 399-403; (3) the privileged classes, pp. 403-406; (4) religious conditions in the eighteenth century, pp. 406-411.



## CHAPTER V

### THE SPIRIT OF REFORM

#### I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN SCIENCE

**123. The Spirit of Conservatism.** An absolute monarchy, a State church, and the system of nobility and serfs, all nourished the spirit of conservatism. They were supposed to have divine sanction and to be unchanging in form and in theory. The king followed in the footsteps of his ancestors, the priests performed the time-honored services of the Church, the serfs tilled the fields as did their forbears, the shoemakers made shoes on lasts fashioned by their grandfathers. To serfdom, feudal dues, the guilds, the monastic orders, and royal officers all were accustomed. That which was sanctioned by ancient custom and went on from day to day without serious modification seemed reasonable. There were, it is true, wars and rumors of wars; princes were occasionally overthrown and new sovereigns were crowned, but the main conditions of life for the mass of the people did not change except very slowly and imperceptibly. All had come out of the past, and respect and veneration for the past appeared as natural as the rising sun.

In such circumstances men looked backward rather than forward. They aspired to fight as well, or to be as saintly, or to write as good books, or paint as beautiful pictures as the great men of old. That they might seriously question the whole order in which they found themselves or discover new and startling truths did not occur to them.

Knowledge was sought not by studying the world about them but in some ancient authority. In Aristotle's (384-322 B.C.) vast range of works on various branches of science the Middle Ages felt that they had a mass of authentic information which it should be the main business of the universities to explain and impart rather

than to increase or correct by new investigations (Vol. I, §§ 286, 696-698). Men's ideals centered in the past, and improvement seemed to them to consist in reviving, so far as possible, "the good old days."

**124. The Rise of the Spirit of Progress.** Many things, however, were making for a new attitude of mind. The world itself was changing. Commerce was carrying the people of Europe to the four corners of the earth, where they observed strange manners, customs, and ideas of which they had never dreamed. Merchants, anxious to increase their trade, did not often take the trouble to inquire whether their customers were Christians or Turks. The unity of the Catholic Church had been broken by the Protestant revolt. The authority of the Anglican Church was challenged by the Dissenters. The United States, the refuge of many sects, was in ferment with ideas of religious toleration and democratic government.

Meanwhile men who devoted themselves to a patient study of natural science appeared upon the scene, steadily undermining the monopoly of learning once enjoyed by the clergy. It was to them that the eighteenth century owed most of its new theories of unbounded progress. It was they who showed that the ancient writers were mistaken about many serious matters and that they had at best a very crude and imperfect notion of the world. They gradually robbed men of their old blind respect for the past, and by their discoveries pointed the way to advance, so that now we expect constant change and improvement and are scarcely astonished at the most marvelous inventions.

**125. The Revolutionary Methods of Natural Science; Roger Bacon (about 1214-1294).** Strange as it may seem, however, the spirit of modern science was anticipated many centuries earlier by the extraordinary Franciscan friar Roger Bacon, who showed his insight by protesting against the extreme veneration of his age for ancient books. Friar Bacon advocated three methods of reaching truth, which are now followed by all scientific men. In the first place, he proposed that natural objects and changes should be examined with great care, in order that the observer might

determine exactly what happened in any given case. This has led in modern times to incredibly refined measurement and analysis. The chemist, for example, can now determine the exact nature and amount of every substance in a cup of impure water, which may appear perfectly limpid to the casual observer. Then, secondly, Bacon advocated experimentation. He was not contented with mere observation of what actually happened, but tried new and artificial combinations and processes. Nowadays experimentation is, of course, constantly used by scientific investigators, and by means of it they ascertain many things which the most careful observation would never reveal. Thirdly, in order to carry on investigation and make careful measurements and experiments, apparatus designed for this special purpose was found to be necessary. Already in the thirteenth century it was discovered, for example, that a convex crystal or bit of glass would magnify objects, although several centuries elapsed before the microscope and telescope were devised.

**126. Francis Bacon (1561-1626).** The first scholar to draw up a great scheme of all the known sciences and work out a method of research which, if conscientiously followed, promised wonderful discoveries, was Francis Bacon, a versatile English statesman and author who wrote in the time of James I. It seemed to him (as it had seemed to his namesake, Roger Bacon, three centuries earlier) that the discoveries which had hitherto been made were as nothing compared with what could be done if men would but study and experiment with things themselves, abandon their confidence in vague words like "moist" and "dry," "matter" and "form," and repudiate altogether "the thorny philosophy" of Aristotle which was taught in the universities. "No one," he declares, "has yet been found so firm of mind and purpose as resolutely to compel himself to sweep away all theories and common notions, and to apply the understanding, thus made fair and even, to a fresh examination of details. Thus it comes about that human knowledge is as yet a mere medley and ill-digested mass, made up of much credulity and much accident, and also of childish notions which we early have imbibed."

**127. Discovery of Natural Laws.** The observation and experimentation of which we have been speaking were carried on by many earnest workers and soon began to influence deeply men's conceptions of the earth and of the universe at large. Of the many scientific discoveries, by far the most fundamental was the conviction that all things about us follow certain natural laws; and it is the determination of these laws and the seeking out of their applications to which the modern scientific investigator devotes his efforts, whether he be calculating the distance of a star or noting the effect of a drop of acid upon a frog's foot. He has given up all hope of reading man's fate in the stars, or of producing any results by magical processes. He is convinced that the natural laws work regularly. Moreover, his study of the regular processes of nature has enabled him, as Roger Bacon foresaw, to work wonders far more marvelous than any attributed to the medieval magician.




FIG. 14. BALLOON ASCENSION, 1783

The crowds along paths of the garden of the Tuileries palace in Paris, on December 1, 1783, saw for the first time two men ascend 2000 feet in a balloon

**128. New Idea of the Universe.** One of the earliest striking discoveries was that the earth, instead of being the fixed center around which the whole universe revolves, is a tiny planet circling each year about the sun and turning each day on its own axis. Copernicus had advanced this theory in an astronomical work published in 1542. It attracted no widespread attention, however, until Galileo constructed a little telescope in 1610 and showed that the sun also revolves on his axis, and that the satellites of Jupiter move about their planet just as the planets move about the sun. The



older writers, like Ptolemy, had pointed out that the earth must be a very tiny thing compared with the whole starry heaven, but they had believed our dwelling place to be the center of all things. They had moreover a very inadequate notion of the stupendous vastness of the universe with its millions of suns, many far larger than ours, moving in various directions, and made, as we now know, of the same substances with which we are familiar on earth.

**129. Opposition to Scientific Discoveries.** But mankind changes its views with reluctance. There were plenty of enemies of the new discoveries who would not take the trouble to observe the workings of nature in laboratories or use the telescope or microscope. Theologians and university professors clung to their old books and declared the views of Galileo opposed to the Bible as they understood it. The bolder thinkers suffered consequently in some cases. Giordano Bruno, one of the earliest enthusiastic supporters of Copernicus, was burned at the stake in Rome in 1600. Galileo was forced to say that he did not believe that the earth went about the sun. He was kept in confinement in his old age and required to repeat certain psalms for his sin in having described the new theories in a work in Italian,—instead of the professorial Latin,—thus making it possible for the public at large to read about the new views of the world.<sup>1</sup>

## II. HOW THE SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES PRODUCED A TENDENCY TOWARD REFORM

**130. How Scientific Knowledge tended to Change Old Ideas.** These new discoveries could hardly fail to alter slowly the old confidence in ancient beliefs. There was a growing distrust of the former ways of looking at things. For example, certain thinkers began to urge that men should freely use their reason and rely much

<sup>1</sup> But even the scientists themselves did not always readily accept new discoveries. Francis Bacon, who lived some seventy years after Copernicus, still clung to the old idea of the revolution of the sun about the earth and still believed in many quite preposterous illusions, as, for example, that "it hath been observed by the ancients that where a rainbow seemeth to hang over or to touch, there breatheth forth a sweet smell"; and that "since the ape is a merry and a bold beast, its heart worn near the heart of a man comforteth the heart and increaseth audacity."

less upon the conclusions that had been reached centuries before. They urged that man might in this way become increasingly wise through the study of the laws of nature, and that he could better his own condition and that of his fellow men if he freed himself from the feeling that he had to go on doing and believing just what his ancestors had done and believed.

**131. Witchcraft.** One of the most terrible mistakes that was given up in the eighteenth century was the belief in witchcraft. It was a very ancient superstition, going back to savage times, that men and women could, with the help of evil spirits, cause disease in those they disliked, could kill their neighbors' cattle and ruin their crops. This notion was revived about the time of Luther's birth and was defended by both Catholics and Protestants. The Pope proclaimed in 1484 that the witches were very active in Germany; that they were afflicting and torturing with dire pains and anguish men, women, and animals; and that "at the suggestion of the enemy of mankind they do not hesitate to commit many other abominable crimes, at the risk of their own souls and as an insult to the Divine Majesty." Soon a long book called *The Witch Hammer* was published in Germany, setting forth the practices of witches and the ways in which they should be tortured in order to force them to confess their misdeeds and the names of others who had done likewise. It was usually helpless old women who were suspected of witchcraft.

**132. General Belief in Witchcraft.** The number of those who were hung or burned in Western Europe as witches during the sixteenth and the early seventeenth century cannot be determined. Some think a hundred thousand, others estimate that there may have been a million or more who were cruelly killed as a result of this old belief. It is certain that doctors, lawyers, ministers, and university professors agreed, with very few exceptions, that there were witches, and that those who questioned the idea were bad men, who wished to disbelieve in the devil in order to give rein to their evil desires. Many are the works on witchcraft from the days of Luther to those of Louis XIV. James I of England wrote a treatise on the subject and condemned all who disbelieved in witchcraft. The last

considerable excitement over witches occurred in Salem, Massachusetts, in 1692, when toward a score of women were hanged for witchcraft. A Boston clergyman, Cotton Mather, wrote a work on the subject, called *The Wonders of the Invisible World*, in which he told all the terrible things the witches had done. He believed that Satan had ruled over the North American Indians, and that he was greatly incensed when the Puritans invaded his territory.

**133. Sudden Disappearance of Witchcraft.** As early as Elizabeth's time a brave writer, Reginald Scott, had published (in 1584) a volume in which he made fun of the idea that there were witches. He wrote his book "for the undeceiving of judges, justices, and juries, and for the preservation of poor, aged, deformed people, frequently taken, arraigned, condemned, and executed for witches." A few others dared later to protest against witchcraft, but they do not seem to have had much effect. The old ideas died out about the year 1700 as a result of new knowledge.

**134. Influence of English Thinkers on France.** In England during the agitations of the Stuart period a number of thoughtful people had not only fought against the old belief in witchcraft, but had advocated toleration and freedom of thought. Among these was John Milton, the poet, who wrote his famous *Arcopagitica* defending the free publication of new ideas. John Locke somewhat later wrote in favor of religious toleration. In 1726 Voltaire, a hitherto unknown Frenchman, visited England and was surprised to find how openly people discussed religious and political questions, far more freely than was possible in France.

Voltaire was deeply impressed by the Quakers—their simple life and their hatred of war. He was delighted with the English philosophers; he admired the English liberty of speech and writing; he respected the general esteem for the merchant class. "In France," he said, "the merchant so constantly hears his business spoken of with disdain that he is fool enough to blush for it; yet I am not sure that the merchant who enriches his country, gives orders from his countinghouse at Surat or Cairo, and contributes to the happiness of the globe is not more useful to a state than the thickly bepowdered lord who knows exactly what time the king

risers and what time he goes to bed, and gives himself mighty airs of greatness while he plays the part of a slave in the minister's anteroom."

**135. Voltaire's Influence.** Voltaire was to become, during the remainder of a long life, the chief advocate throughout Europe of reliance upon reason and of confidence in enlightenment and progress. His keen eye was continually discovering some new absurdity in the existing order, which, with incomparable wit and literary skill, he would expose to his eager readers. He was interested in almost everything; he wrote histories, dramas, philosophic treatises, romances, epics, and innumerable letters to his innumerable admirers. The vast range of his writings enabled him to bring his bold questionings to the attention of all sorts and conditions of men—not only to the general reader but even to the careless playgoer.

While Voltaire was advocating free criticism in general, he led a relentless attack upon the most venerable, probably the most powerful, institution in Europe, the Roman Catholic Church. The absolute power of the king did not trouble him, but the Church, with what appeared to him to be its deep-seated opposition to a free exercise of reason and its hostility to reform, seemed fatally to block all human progress. The Church, as it fully realized, had never encountered a more deadly enemy. He saw only evil in the Church and seemed incapable of understanding all that it had done for mankind during the bygone ages. He maliciously attributed to evil motives teachings which were accepted by the best and loftiest of men. He bitterly ridiculed cherished religious ideas, along with the censorship of the press and the quarrels among the theologians themselves. While Voltaire ruthlessly attacked the evils for which he held the Roman Catholic Church responsible, he was a firm believer in God, whom he regarded as the Creator of man and the world. At his countryhouse at Ferney, on the Lake of Geneva, he erected a temple which he dedicated to the God of Nature.

Voltaire could, and did, however, fight bravely against wrong and oppression. The evils which he attacked were in large part abolished by the French Revolution.



136. Diderot's *Encyclopedia*. Voltaire had many admirers and powerful allies. Among these none were more important than Denis Diderot and the scholars whom Diderot induced to coöperate with him in preparing articles for a new *Encyclopedia*, which was designed to spread among a wide range of intelligent readers a knowledge of scientific advance and rouse enthusiasm for reform and progress. An encyclopedia was by no means a new thing. Diderot's plan had been suggested by a proposal to publish a French translation of Chambers's *Cyclopædia*. Before his first volume appeared, a vast *Universal Dictionary* had been completed in Germany in sixty-four volumes. But few people outside of that country could read German in those days, whereas the well-written and popular articles of Diderot and his helpers, ranging from "abacus," "abbey," and "abdication" to "Zoroaster," "Zurich," and "zymology," were in a language that many people all over Europe could understand.

137. The *Encyclopedia* rouses the Hostility of the Theologians. Diderot and his fellow editors endeavored to rouse as little opposition as possible. They respected current prejudices and gave space to ideas and opinions with which they were not personally in sympathy. They furnished material, however, for refuting what they believed to be mistaken notions, and Diderot declared that "time will enable people to distinguish what we have thought from what we have said." But no sooner did the first two volumes appear in 1752 than the king's ministers, to please the clergy, suppressed them, as containing principles hostile to royal authority and religion; although they did not forbid the continuation of the work.

138. Diderot nevertheless completes the *Encyclopedia*. As volume after volume appeared the subscribers increased, but so did the opposition. The Encyclopedists were declared to be a band bent upon the destruction of religion and the undermining of society; the government again interfered, withdrew the license to publish the work, and prohibited the sale of the seven volumes that were already out. Nevertheless seven years later Diderot was able to deliver the remaining ten volumes to the subscribers in spite of the government's prohibition.




FIG. 15. LEADERS OF THE REVOLUTION IN THOUGHT

*Rousseau - Eng - unpopular at home -*

*S. Miller*

**139. Value of the *Encyclopedia*.** The *Encyclopedia* attacked temperately, but effectively, religious intolerance, the bad taxes, the slave trade, and the atrocities of the criminal law; it encouraged men to turn their minds to natural science with all its beneficent possibilities, and this helped to discourage the old interest in theology and barren metaphysics. The article "Legislator," written by Diderot, says: "All the men of all lands have become necessary to one another for the exchange of the fruits of industry and the products of the soil. Commerce is a new bond among men. In these days every nation has an interest in the preservation by every other nation of its wealth, its industry, its banks, its luxury, its agriculture. The ruin of Leipzig, of Lisbon, of Lima, has led to bankruptcies on all the exchanges of Europe and has affected the fortunes of many millions of persons." The English statesman John Morley is doubtless right when he says, in his enthusiastic account of Diderot and his companions, that "it was this band of writers, organized by a harassed man of letters, and not the nobles swarming around Louis XV, nor the churchmen, who first grasped the great principle of modern society, the honor that is owed to productive industry. They were vehement for the glories of peace and passionate against the brazen glories of war."

### III. NEW IDEAS OF GOVERNMENT AND ITS FUNCTIONS

**140. Montesquieu (1689-1755) and his *Spirit of Laws*.** Neither Voltaire nor Diderot had attacked the kings and their despotic system of government. Montesquieu, however, while expressing great loyalty to French institutions, opened the eyes of his fellow citizens to the disadvantages and abuses of their government by his enthusiastic eulogy of the limited monarchy of England. In his celebrated work *The Spirit of Laws* he proves from history that governments are the natural products of special conditions and should meet the needs of a particular people at a particular period. England, he thought, had developed an especially happy system.

**141. Rousseau and his attack on Civilization.** Next to Voltaire, the writer who did most to cultivate discontent with existing



conditions was Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Unlike Voltaire and Diderot, Rousseau believed that people thought too much, not too little; that we should trust to our hearts rather than to our heads and may safely rely upon our natural feelings and sentiments to guide us. He declared that Europe was overcivilized, and summoned men to return to nature and simplicity. His first work was a prize essay written in 1750, in which he sought to prove that the development of the arts and sciences had demoralized mankind, inasmuch as they had produced luxury, insincerity, and arrogance. He extolled the rude vigor of Sparta and denounced the refined and degenerate life of the Athenians.



FIG. 16. JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

**142. Rousseau's *Émile*.** Later Rousseau wrote a book on education, called *Émile*, which is still famous. In this he protests against the efforts made by teachers to improve upon nature, for, he maintains, "All things are good as their Author made them,

but everything degenerates in the hands of man. . . . To form this rare creature, man, what have we to do? Much doubtless, but chiefly to prevent anything from being done. . . . All our wisdom consists in servile prejudices; all our customs are but anxiety and restraint. Civilized man is born, lives, dies in a state of slavery. At his birth he is sewed in swaddling clothes; at his death he is nailed in a coffin; as long as he preserves the human form he is fettered by our institutions."

**143. *The Social Contract*.** Rousseau's plea for the simple life went to the heart of many a person who was weary of complications and artificiality. Others were attracted by his firm belief in the natural equality of mankind and the right of every man to



have a voice in the government. In his celebrated little treatise *The Social Contract* he takes up the question, By what right does one man rule over others? The book opens with the words: "Man is born free and yet is now everywhere in chains. One man believes himself the master of others and yet is after all more of a slave than they. How did this change come about? I do not know. What can render it legitimate? I believe that I can answer that question."

It is, Rousseau declares, the will of the people that renders government legitimate. The real sovereign is the people. Although they may appoint a single person, such as a king, to manage the government for them, they should make the laws, since it is they who must obey them. We shall find that the first French constitution accepted Rousseau's doctrine and defined law as "the expression of the general will"—not the will of a king reigning by the grace of God.

144. **Beccaria (1735–1794) attacks Cruel Laws.** Among all the books advocating urgent reforms which appeared in the eighteenth century none accomplished more than a little volume by the Italian economist and jurist Beccaria, which exposed with great clearness and vigor the atrocities of the criminal law.

The trials in all countries were scandalously unfair and the punishments incredibly cruel. The accused was not ordinarily allowed any counsel and was required to give evidence against himself. Indeed, it was common enough to use torture to force a confession from him. Witnesses were examined secretly and separately and their evidence recorded before they faced the accused. Informers were rewarded, and the flimsiest evidence was considered sufficient in the case of atrocious crimes. After a criminal had been convicted he might be tortured by the rack, or thumbscrews, by applying fire to different parts of his body, or in other ways, to induce him to reveal the names of his accomplices.

The death penalty was established for a great variety of offenses besides murder—for example, heresy, counterfeiting, highway robbery, even sacrilege. In England there were, according to the great jurist Blackstone, a hundred and sixty offenses punishable

with death, including cutting down trees in an orchard and stealing a sum over five shillings in a shop or more than twelve pence from a person's pocket. Yet in spite of the long list of capital offenses, the trials in England were far more reasonable than on the Continent, for they were public and conducted before a jury, and torture was not used. Moreover, owing to *Habeas Corpus* no one could be imprisoned long before being brought to trial.

**145. Beccaria advocates Public Trials and Milder Punishments.** In his famous little book on *Crimes and Punishments* Beccaria advocated public trials, in which the accused should be confronted by those who gave evidence against him. Secret accusations should no longer be considered. Like Voltaire, Montesquieu, and many others, he denounced the practice of torturing a suspected person with a view of compelling him by bodily anguish to confess himself guilty of crimes of which he might be quite innocent. As for punishments, he advocated the entire abolition of the death penalty, on the ground that it did not deter the evildoer as life imprisonment at hard labor would, and that in its various hideous forms—beheading, hanging, mutilation, breaking on the wheel—it was a source of demoralization to the spectators.

Punishments should be less harsh but more certain and more carefully proportioned to the danger of the offense to society. Nobles and magistrates convicted of crime should be treated exactly like offenders of the lowest class. Confiscation of property should be abolished, since it brought suffering to the innocent members of the criminal's family. It was better, he urged, to prevent crimes than to punish them, and this could be done by making the laws very clear and the punishments for their violation very certain, but, above all, by spreading enlightenment through better education.

**146. Political Economy develops in the Eighteenth Century.** About the middle of the eighteenth century a new social science was born, namely, *political economy*. Scholars began to investigate the sources of a nation's wealth, the manner in which commodities were produced and distributed, the laws determining

demand and supply, the function of money and credit and their influence upon industry and commerce. Previous to the eighteenth century these matters had seemed unworthy of scientific discussion. Few suspected that there were any great laws underlying the varying amount of wheat that could be bought for a shilling or the rate of interest that a bank could charge. The ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome had despised the tiller of the soil, the shopkeeper, and the artisan, for these indispensable members of society at that period were commonly slaves. The contempt for manual labor had decreased in the Middle Ages, but the learned men who studied theology, or pondered over Aristotle's teachings in regard to "form" and "essence," rarely thought of considering the effect of the growth of population upon serfdom, or of an export duty upon commerce, any more than they tried to determine why the housewife's milk soured more readily in warm weather than in cold, or why a field left fallow regained its fertility.<sup>1</sup>

**147. Tendency of the Governments to regulate Business.** Although ignorant of economic laws, the governments had come gradually to regulate more and more both commerce and industry. Each country tried to keep all the trade for its own merchants by issuing elaborate regulations and restrictions, and the king's officers enforced the monopoly of the guilds. Indeed, the French government, under Colbert's influence, fell into the habit of regulating well-nigh everything. In order that the goods which were produced in France might find a ready sale abroad, the government fixed the quality and width of the cloth which might be manufactured and the character of the dyes which should be used. The king's ministers kept a constant eye upon the dealers in grain and breadstuffs, forbidding the storing up of these products or their sale outside a market. In this way they had hoped to prevent profiteers from accumulating grain in order to sell it at a high rate in times of scarcity.

In short, at the opening of the eighteenth century statesmen, merchants, and such scholars as gave any attention to the subject

<sup>1</sup> The medieval philosophers and theologians discussed, it is true, the question whether it was right or not to charge interest for money loaned, and what might be a "just price."

believed that the wealth of a country could be greatly increased by government regulation and encouragement. It was also commonly believed that a country, to be really prosperous, must export more than it imported, so that foreign nations would each year owe it a cash balance, which would have to be paid in gold or silver and in this way increase its stock of precious metals. Those who advocated using the powers of government to encourage and protect shipping, to develop colonies, and to regulate manufactures are known as "mercantilists."

**148. The Rise of the "Free Trade" School.** About the year 1700, however, certain writers in France and England reached the conclusion that the government did no good by interfering with natural economic laws which it did not understand and whose workings it did not reckon with. They argued that the government restrictions often produced the worst possible results; that industry would advance far more rapidly if manufacturers were free to adopt new inventions instead of being confined by the government's restrictions to old and discredited methods; that, in France, the government's frantic efforts to prevent famines by making all sorts of rules in regard to selling grain only increased the distress, since even the most powerful king could not violate with impunity an economic law. So the new economists rejected the formerly popular mercantile policy. They accused the mercantilists of identifying gold and silver with wealth, and maintained that a country might be prosperous without a favorable cash balance. In short, the new school advocated "free trade." A French economist urged his king to adopt the motto *Laissez faire* (Let things alone) if he would see his realms prosper.

**149. Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776).** The first great systematic work upon political economy was published by a Scotch philosopher, Adam Smith, in 1776. His *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* became the basis of all further progress in the science. He attacked the doctrines of the mercantilists and the various expedients which they had favored,—import duties, bounties, restrictions upon exporting grain, etc.,—all of which he believed "retard instead of accelerating



the progress of society toward real wealth and greatness; and diminish instead of increasing the real value of the annual produce of its labor and land." In general he held that the State should content itself with protecting traders and business men and seeing that justice was done; but he sympathized with the English navigation laws (§ 77), although they obviously hampered commerce, and was not as thoroughgoing a free trader as many of the later English economists.

**150. The Economists attack Existing Evils.** While the economists in France and England by no means agreed in details, they were at one in believing that it was useless and harmful to interfere with what they held to be the economic laws. They brought the light of reason to bear, for example, upon the various bungling and iniquitous old methods of taxation then in vogue, and many of them advocated a single tax which should fall directly upon the landowner. They wrote treatises on practical questions, scattered pamphlets broadcast, and even conducted a magazine or two in the hope of bringing home to the people at large the existing economic evils.

It is clear from what has been said that the eighteenth century was a period of unexampled advance in general enlightenment. New knowledge spread abroad by the Encyclopedists, the economists, and writers on government led people to see the vices of the existing system and gave them at the same time new hope of bettering themselves by abandoning the mistaken beliefs and imperfect methods of their predecessors. The spirit of reform penetrated even into kings' palaces, and we must turn in the following chapter to the attempts made in the more progressive European countries to remedy long-standing evils.

### QUESTIONS

I. Contrast the spirit of reform with that of conservatism. What justifications are there for each? What is meant by "progress"? What class of men was responsible for changing the intellectual viewpoint of the eighteenth century? Name some pioneers of the new methods of discovering truth. Describe these methods. Why was the

discovery of natural law the most important of all scientific discoveries? Why were conservative theologians opposed to the new view of the world?

II. Who were the Deists? What things in England most interested Voltaire? What were Voltaire's chief claims to greatness? What were his weaknesses? How did Diderot's *Encyclopedia* influence public opinion in France?

III. In what way did the work of Montesquieu influence the making of constitutions? How did Rousseau's doctrines lead to a criticism of despotism in France? Describe the evils of criminal law in the eighteenth century. What is political economy? Why was it not studied in the Middle Ages? What is meant by *Laissez faire*? Discuss the doctrines of Adam Smith.

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) the ancient and the modern attitude toward science, pp. 172-178; (2) science and the spirit of reform, pp. 179-182; (3) some of Voltaire's ideas, pp. 182-184; (4) Diderot on the *Encyclopedia*, pp. 185-187; (5) Rousseau's theories, pp. 188-191; (6) Beccaria's argument against cruel punishments, pp. 192-196; (7) the new study of political economy, pp. 196-199.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Francis Bacon, Isaac Newton, Voltaire, Denis Diderot, J. J. Rousseau, Adam Smith, Deism, and Encyclopedia. ROBINSON, *History of Western Europe*, Vol. II: questioning of authority—heavenly and earthly, pp. 96-161.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the growth of natural science, pp. 415-418; (2) the French reformers, pp. 418-424; (3) Adam Smith and political economy, pp. 425-426.

## CHAPTER VI

### BEGINNINGS OF REFORM BEFORE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

#### I. REFORMS OF FREDERICK II, CATHERINE II, AND JOSEPH II

151. The "Benevolent Despots." The monarchs whose wars we have been following—Frederick the Great, Catherine the Great, Maria Theresa, and Emperor Joseph II—are commonly known as the "enlightened" or "benevolent" despots. They read the works of the reformers and planned all sorts of ways in which they might better the conditions in their realms by removing old restrictions which hampered the farmer and merchant, by making new and clearer laws, by depriving the clergy of wealth and power which seemed to them excessive, and by encouraging manufactures and promoting commerce.

These monarchs are commonly known as the "enlightened" or "benevolent" despots. They were no doubt more "enlightened" than the older kings; at least they all read books and associated with learned men. But they were not more "benevolent" than Charlemagne, Alfred the Great, St. Louis, or many other monarchs of earlier centuries, who had believed it their duty to do all they could for the welfare of their people. On the other hand, the monarchs of the eighteenth century were certainly "despots" in the full sense of the word. They held, like Louis XIV, that all the powers of the State were vested in them, and had no idea of granting their subjects any share in the government. Moreover they waged war upon one another as their predecessors had done, and were constantly trying, as we have seen, to add to their own territories by robbing their neighbors.

152. Attitude of Frederick the Great. When Frederick the Great became king he devoted himself less to music and philosophy and more to the practical problems of government. He allowed

the people no part in the government, it is true, but he worked very hard himself. He rose early and was busy all day. He was his own prime minister and the real head of all branches of the government, watching over the army and leading it in battle, attending to foreign affairs, guarding the finances, overseeing the courts, journeying up and down the land investigating the conduct of his officials and examining into the condition of his people.

He spent his free time studying literature, philosophy, history, and mathematics, and carrying on a correspondence with learned men of all nations, especially with Voltaire, who was actually induced to live for a time at Frederick's palace in Potsdam. The Prussian king was also very fond indeed of writing and seized every spare moment of a busy life to push forward his works upon history, politics, and military matters. No less than twenty-four volumes of his writings were published shortly after his death. They were all written in French, for Frederick, unlike his successors, had a contempt for German, which seemed to him a barbarous tongue.

In religious matters Frederick was extremely tolerant; he held that his subjects should be allowed to worship God in any way they pleased. His kingdom had long been Protestant, but there were many Catholics in various parts of it. He welcomed Huguenots and Jesuits with equal cordiality and admitted Catholics as well as Protestants to his service. He once said: "He who wrongs his brother of a different faith shall be punished; were I to declare for one or the other creed I should excite party spirit and persecution; my aim, on the contrary, is to show the adherents of the different churches that they are all fellow citizens."

**153. Catherine II, Empress of Russia (1762-1796).** In Russia, Peter the Great had been a genuine "benevolent despot," although the benevolence was more apparent to later generations than to his own half-Asiatic subjects. But in the days of Frederick the Great the ruler of all the Russias was a German woman, Catherine II, who is one of the most picturesque and interesting figures in history. She was the daughter of one of Frederick the Great's officers and had been selected by him in 1743, at the



request of the Tsarina Elizabeth, Peter's younger daughter,<sup>1</sup> as a suitable wife for her nephew, the heir to the throne. At the age of fourteen this inexperienced girl found herself in the midst of the intrigues of the court at St. Petersburg; she joined the Greek Church, exchanged her name of Sophia for that of



FIG. 17. CATHERINE II

Catherine, and, by zealous study of both books and men, prepared to make her new name famous. Her husband, who ruled for six months as Peter III, proved to be a worthless fellow, who early began to neglect and maltreat her. Catherine won over the imperial guard and had herself proclaimed empress. Peter was forced to abdicate and was carried off by some of Catherine's supporters, who put him to death, perhaps with her silent consent.

#### 154. Character of Catherine the Great. In the spirit of

Peter the Great, Catherine determined to carry on the Europeanizing of Russia and extend her empire. She was thoroughly unscrupulous and hypocritical, but she was shrewd in the choice and management of her ministers and was herself a hard worker. She rose at six o'clock in the morning, hurried through her toilet, prepared her own light breakfast, and turned to the dull and difficult business of government, carefully considering the reports laid before her relating to the army, the navy, finances, and foreign affairs.

<sup>1</sup> Peter was succeeded in 1725 by his widow, Catherine, who ruled ably for two years. His son Alexis had been tortured to death in prison for rebellion, and so Alexis's son, Peter II, followed his grandmother. Under Anne (1730-1740), niece of Peter I, German influence triumphed. Elizabeth (1741-1762), Peter's younger daughter, referred to in the text, next ascended the throne. She hated Frederick II for his personal remarks about her and aided Maria Theresa against him.

Catherine II showed herself almost as interested in the French philosophers and reformers of the time as did Frederick. She subscribed for the *Encyclopedia*, and bought Diderot's library when he got into trouble, permitting him to continue to use the books as long as he wished. In her frequent letters to Voltaire she explained to him her various plans for reform.

**155. Catherine maintains Serfdom but seizes the Church Lands.** There was some talk of abolishing serfdom in Russia, but Catherine rather increased than decreased the number of serfs, and she made their lot harder than it had been before by forbidding them to complain of the treatment they received at the hands of their masters. She seized the vast property of the churches and monasteries, using the income to support the clergy and monks, and such surplus as remained she devoted to schools and hospitals.

**156. Rash Reforms of Joseph II (1765-1790).** It is clear that while Frederick and Catherine expressed great admiration for the reformers, they did not attempt to make any sweeping changes in the laws or the condition of the people. Emperor Joseph II, who, after the death of his mother, Maria Theresa, in 1780, became ruler of the Austrian dominions, had, however, the courage of his convictions. He proposed to transform the scattered and heterogeneous territories over which he ruled into a well-organized state in which disorder, confusion, prejudice, and the dislike of new ideas should disappear and all his subjects be put in possession of their "natural" rights. Germans, Hungarians, Italians, Poles, Bohemians, and Belgians were all to use the German language in official communications. The old irregular territorial divisions were abolished and his realms divided into thirteen new provinces. All the ancient privileges enjoyed by the towns and the local assemblies were done away with and replaced by a uniform system of government in which his own officials enjoyed the control.

Joseph visited France and made the acquaintance of Rousseau and other French reformers. He attacked the Church, which was so powerful in his realms. He was heartily opposed to the monks; he consequently abolished some six hundred of their monasteries and used their property for charitable purposes and to establish

schools. He appointed the bishops without consulting the Pope and forbade sending money to Rome. Marriage licenses were to be granted by the government, not the Church, and so were taken out of the control of the priests. Lutherans, Calvinists, and other heretics were allowed to worship in their own way.

Joseph II sought to complete his work by attacking the surviving features of feudalism and encouraging the development of manufactures. He freed the serfs in Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and Hungary, transforming the peasants into tenants; elsewhere he reduced the services due from them to the lord. He taxed nobles and clergy without regard to their claims to exemption and supplanted the confused and uncertain laws by a uniform system which became the basis of later Austrian law.

Naturally Joseph met opposition on every hand. The clergy abhorred him as an oppressor, and all who were forced to sacrifice their old privileges did what they could to block his reforms, however salutary they might be. Joseph died in 1790, a sadly disappointed man. He had been forced to undo almost all that he had hoped to accomplish, and his reforms left few permanent results.

**157. General Policy of the Benevolent Despots.** It has become clear, as we have reviewed the activities of these benevolent despots, that all of them were chiefly intent upon increasing their own power; they were more despotic than they were benevolent. They opposed the power of the Pope and brought the clergy under their own control. In some cases they took a portion of the property of the churches and monasteries. They tried to improve the laws and do away with existing contradictions and obscurities. They endeavored to "centralize" the administration and to place all power in the hands of their own officials instead of leaving it with the nobles or the old local assemblies. They encouraged agriculture, commerce, and industries in various ways. All these measures were undertaken primarily with a view to strengthening the absolute power of the ruler and increasing the income and the military strength of his government, for none of these energetic monarchs showed any willingness to admit the people to a share in the government, and only Joseph II ventured to attempt to free the serfs.

## II. ENGLAND AFTER THE REVOLUTION OF 1688

**158. England Leader in Reform in the Seventeenth Century.** In the matter of reform England had been the leading country in the seventeenth century. She had built up a system of government in which the people (represented in Parliament), not the king, were supposed to be the guiding power. She had executed one king and expelled another who tried to maintain the doctrine of the divine right of monarchs. She permitted great freedom in religious belief and in the expression of new ideas. John Milton, the celebrated poet, had written an unrivaled defense of the liberty of the press, and John Locke, a great philosopher, had given overwhelming reasons for permitting people to hold the religious views they preferred without interference on the part of the government. The Royal Society was doing much to advance natural science. England's great writers, like Francis Bacon, Newton, and Locke, were read across the Channel and had done much to stimulate thought in France and other countries.

**159. Questions settled by the Accession of William and Mary.** With the accession of William and Mary in 1688 (Vol. I, § 854) England may be said to have practically settled the two great questions that had produced such serious dissensions during the previous fifty years. In the first place, the nation had clearly shown that it proposed to remain Protestant in spite of the Catholic sympathies of her former Stuart kings; and the relations between the Church of England and the Dissenters were gradually being satisfactorily adjusted. In the second place, the powers of the king had been carefully defined, and from the opening of the eighteenth century to the present time no English monarch has ventured to veto an act of Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

**160. The Union of England and Scotland (1707).** William III was succeeded in 1702 by his sister-in-law, Anne, a younger daughter of James II. Far more important than the war which her generals carried on against Spain was the final union of

<sup>1</sup> The last instance in which an English ruler vetoed a measure passed by Parliament was in 1707.




England and Scotland. The difficulties between the two countries had led to much bloodshed and suffering ever since Edward I's futile attempt to conquer Scotland four centuries earlier (Vol. I, § 562). The two countries had, it is true, been under the same ruler since the accession of James I, but each had maintained its own independent parliament and system of government. Finally, in 1707, both nations agreed to unite their governments into one. Forty-five members of the British House of Commons were to be chosen thereafter in Scotland, and sixteen Scotch lords were to be added to the English House of Lords. In this way the whole island of Great Britain was placed under a single government, and the occasions for strife were thereby greatly reduced.

**161. Accession of George I (1714-1727) of Hanover.** Since none of Anne's children survived her, she was succeeded, according to an arrangement made before her accession, by the nearest Protestant heir. This was the son of James I's granddaughter Sophia. She had married the elector of Hanover<sup>1</sup>; consequently the new king of England, George I, was also elector of Hanover and a member of the Holy Roman Empire.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Originally there had been seven electors (Vol. I, § 728), but the duke of Bavaria had been made an elector during the Thirty Years' War, and in 1692 the father of George I had been permitted to assume the title of "Elector of Hanover."

<sup>2</sup> James I (1603-1625)



**162. England and the "Balance of Power."** William of Orange had been a continental statesman before he became king of England, and his chief aim had always been to prevent France from becoming overpowerful. He had joined in the War of the Spanish Succession in order to maintain the "balance of power" between the various European countries.<sup>1</sup> During the eighteenth century England continued, for the same reason, to intervene in the struggles between the continental powers, although she had no expectation of attempting to extend her sway across the Channel. The wars which she waged in order to increase her own power and territory were, as we have seen (Chapter III), carried on in distant parts of the world and more often on sea than on land.

**163. "Prince Charlie," the Young Pretender, in Scotland.** When, in 1740, Frederick the Great and the French attacked Maria Theresa (§ 49), England supported the injured queen. France thereupon sent the grandson of James II,<sup>2</sup> the Young Pretender, as he was called, with a fleet to invade England. The attempt failed, but in 1745 the Young Pretender made another attempt to gain the English crown. He landed in Scotland, where he found support among the Highland chiefs, and even Edinburgh welcomed "Prince Charlie." He was able to collect an army and marched into England. He was quickly forced back into Scotland, however, and after a disastrous defeat on Culloden Moor (1746) and many romantic adventures, he was glad to reach France once more in safety.

### III. THE ENGLISH LIMITED MONARCHY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY AND GEORGE III

**164. Limited Monarchy of England.** In striking contrast to the absolute rule of the "benevolent despots" on the Continent, the island of Britain was, as we have seen, governed by its Parliament. There the king, from the Revolution of 1688 on, had

<sup>1</sup> Wolsey advanced the same reason in Henry VIII's time for England's intervention in continental wars (Vol. I, § 760).

<sup>2</sup> The children of James II by his second and Catholic wife, Mary of Modena, had been excluded from the throne at the accession of William and Mary.

owed his crown to Parliament and admitted that he was limited by the constitution, which he had to obey. This did not prevent at least one English king from trying to have his own way in spite of the restrictions placed upon him, as we shall see.

**165. Whigs and Tories.** There were two great political parties in England—the Whigs, successors of the Roundheads, who believed in the supremacy of Parliament and championed toleration for the Dissenters; and the Tories, who, like the earlier Cavaliers (Vol. I, § 839), upheld the divine right of kings and the supremacy of the Anglican, or Established, Church. After the death of Anne many of the Tories favored calling to the throne the son of James II (popularly called “the Old Pretender”), whereupon the Whigs succeeded in making their rivals unpopular by calling them Jacobites and traitors. They made the new Hanoverian king, George I, believe that he owed everything to the Whigs, and for a period of nearly fifty years, under George I and George II, they were able to control Parliament.

**166. Robert Walpole, Prime Minister (1721–1742).** George I himself spoke no English, was ignorant of English politics, and was much more interested in Hanover than in his new kingdom. He did not attend the meetings of his ministers, as his predecessors had done, and turned over the management of affairs to the Whig leaders. They found a skillful “boss” and a judicious statesman in Sir Robert Walpole, who maintained his own power and that of his party by avoiding war and preventing religious dissensions at home. He used the king’s funds to buy the votes necessary to maintain the Whig majority in the House of Commons and to get his measures through that body. He was England’s first *prime minister*.

**167. Development of the Cabinet and the Office of Prime Minister.** The existence of two well-defined political parties standing for widely different policies forced the king to choose all his ministers from either one or the other. The more prominent among his advisers came gradually to form a little group who resigned together if Parliament refused to accept the measures they favored. In this way the “cabinet government”

developed, with a prime minister, or premier, at its head. Under weak monarchs the prime minister would naturally be the real ruler of the kingdom.

**168. The Position of the King.** It was still possible, to be sure, for the king to profit by the jealousies of rival statesmen and to keep the upper hand by favoring first one, then another. This was especially the case after the Tories gave up hope of restoring the Stuarts, upon the failure of Prince Charles in 1745, so that the Hanoverian kings no longer needed to rely upon the Whigs as the one loyal party.

**169. George III and Parliament.** Finally, George III, who came to the throne in 1760, succeeded in getting a party of his own, known as the "King's Friends," and with their aid, and a liberal use of what would now be regarded as bribery and graft, ran the government much as he wanted to. His mother, a German princess, had taught him that he ought to be a king like those on the Continent, and, in spite of the restrictions of Parliament, he did rule in a high-handed and headstrong way. During the war with the American colonies, which soon broke out, he was practically his own prime minister.

**170. Parliament not really Representative.** The really weak spot in the English constitution, however, was not so much the high-handedness of the king as the fact that Parliament did not represent the nation as a whole. A hereditary House of Lords could block any measure introduced in the House of Commons, and the House of Commons itself represented not the nation but a small minority of landowners and traders. Government offices were monopolized by members of the Established Church, and the poor were oppressed by cruel criminal laws administered by officials chosen by the king. Workingmen were prohibited from forming associations to promote their interests. It was more than a century after the accession of George III before the English peasant could go to the ballot box and vote for members of Parliament.

**171. Growing Demand for Reform.** Already in the eighteenth century there was no little discontent with the control which



the landed gentry and the rich enjoyed in Parliament. There was an increasing number of writers to point out to the people the defects in the English system. They urged that every man should have the right to participate in the government by casting his vote, and that the unwritten constitution of England should be written



FIG. 18. AN ELECTION IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. (DRAWN BY HOGARTH)

Hogarth, who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century, was fond of depicting in a satirical spirit the life of his time. He shows in this drawing the informal character of an election and the open way in which the voters accepted money for their votes and then cast them under the eye of those who had bribed them. The habit of gaining seats in the House of Commons by bribery had become very common in the eighteenth century. Many men who had made fortunes in India were willing to pay well to secure election and often succeeded in gaining the necessary votes in districts where they were complete strangers. The laws made by Parliament to check this evil had little or no effect until the introduction of the Australian secret ballot in the nineteenth century

down and so made clear and unmistakable. Political clubs were founded, which entered into correspondence with political societies in France; newspapers and pamphlets poured from the press, and political reform found champions in the House of Commons.

**172. The Younger Pitt.** This demand for reform finally induced the younger Pitt (son of the Earl of Chatham), who was

prime minister from 1783 to 1801, to introduce bills into the House of Commons for remedying some inequalities in representation. But the violence and disorder accompanying the French Revolution, which began in 1789, involved England in a long and tedious war and discredited reform with Englishmen who had formerly favored change, to say nothing of the Tories, who regarded with horror any proposal looking toward an increase in the power of the people.

**173. The Case of France.** Nothing has been said in this chapter of the efforts of the French king to play the rôle of a benevolent despot. This is because his feeble attempts to better conditions in his realm led to such an overwhelming change that he and his ancient monarchy were swept away. The conditions and events in France which led to the great Revolution will therefore be given a special chapter, on account of the momentous importance of that event for the whole future of mankind.

#### QUESTIONS

I. What is meant by the term "benevolent despot"? Name three benevolent despots of the eighteenth century. Describe the life of Frederick the Great after he came to the throne. What were his views on the subject of religion?

Sketch the early life of Catherine II of Russia. Compare her work as a ruler with that of Frederick the Great. Describe the reforms of Joseph II of Austria. In what general way does his work differ from that of the monarch just named? What points of agreement or of difference are there between his policy and that of Frederick the Great? between his policy and that of Catherine II?

II. What great questions were settled in England during the struggles of the seventeenth century? How were England and Scotland united? How did the Hanoverian line gain the English throne? What is meant by the "balance of power"? Do we hear the expression nowadays? What attempts did the Stuarts make to regain the throne?

III. Contrast the limited monarchy of England with the benevolent despotism of the Continent. Discuss the two great political parties of England. Who was Sir Robert Walpole? Describe the origin of the cabinet. Explain the position of the king during the eighteenth century. What was the great cause of dissatisfaction with parliamentary government in England in the eighteenth century?

## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) Frederick the Great's benevolent despotism, pp. 202-209; (2) the reforms of Joseph II, pp. 213-220; (3) the peculiar features of the English government in the eighteenth century, pp. 220-224.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Frederick II (of Prussia), Catherine II (of Russia), Joseph II (of Austria), Robert Walpole, William Pitt (Earl of Chatham), and Cabinet.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the British monarchy and parliamentary reform, pp. 430-440; (2) the enlightened despots, pp. 440-448.

# BOOK III. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND NAPOLEON

## CHAPTER VII

### THE EVE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

#### I. CONFUSION OF THE OLD RÉGIME

**174. France leads Europe in Reforms.** It was France that first carried out the great reforms which did away with most of the old institutions and the confusion that had come down from the Middle Ages. In 1789 the king of France asked his people to submit their complaints to him and to send representatives to Versailles to confer with him upon the state of the realm and the ways in which the government might be improved so as to increase the general happiness and the prosperity of the kingdom. And then the miracle happened! The French National Assembly swept away many of the old evils with an ease and thoroughness which put the petty reforms of the benevolent despots to shame. It accomplished more in a few months than the reforming kings had done in a century; for those kings had never dreamed of calling in their people to aid them. Instead of availing themselves of the interest and help of the people, they had tried to do everything alone by royal decrees, and so had failed.

**175. Mistake of confounding Reform with "the Terror."** The great importance of the reformation accomplished by the French Assembly is, however, often obscured by the disorder which accompanied it. When one meets the words "French Revolution," he is pretty sure to call up before his mind's eye the guillotine and its hundreds of victims, and the Paris mob shouting the hymn of the Marseillaise as they paraded the streets with the heads of



unfortunate "aristocrats" on their pikes. Everyone has heard of this terrible episode in French history even if he knows practically nothing of the permanent good which was accomplished at the time. Indeed, it has made so deep an impression on people that the Reign of Terror is often mistaken for the real Revolution. It was, however, only a sequel to it, an unhappy accident, which seems less and less important as the years go on, while the achievements of the Revolution itself loom larger and larger.

**176. Meaning of the Term "the Old Régime."** We have already examined the institutions which were common to most of the European countries in the eighteenth century,—despotic kings, arbitrary imprisonment, unfair taxation, censorship of the press, serfdom, feudal dues, friction between Church and State,—all of which the reformers had been busy denouncing as contrary to reason and humanity, and some of which the benevolent despots and their ministers had, in a half-hearted way, attempted to remedy. The various relics of bygone times and of outlived conditions which the Revolution abolished forever are commonly called in France *the old régime*.<sup>1</sup> In order to see why France took the lead of other European countries in modernizing itself, it is necessary to examine somewhat carefully the particular causes of discontent there. We shall then see how almost everyone, from the king to the peasant, came to realize that the old system was bad and consequently resolved to do away with it.

**177. France a Patchwork of Conquests.** Of the evils which the Revolution abolished, none was more important than the confusion in France due to the fact that it was not in the eighteenth century a well-organized, knit-together state whose citizens all enjoyed the same rights and privileges. A long line of kings had patched it together, adding bit by bit as they could. By conquest and bargain, by marrying heiresses, and through the dying-out of feudal families, the original small domains of the early French kings about Paris and Orleans had been gradually increased by their descendants. Louis XIV gained Alsace and Strasbourg and some towns on the borders of the

<sup>1</sup> From the French *ancien régime*, the old or former system.

Spanish Netherlands. Louis XV added Lorraine in 1766. Two years later the island of Corsica was ceded to France by Genoa. So when Louis XVI came to the throne in 1774 he found himself ruler of practically the whole territory which makes up France to-day. But these different parts had different institutions.



THE PROVINCES OF FRANCE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, SHOWING INTERIOR CUSTOMS LINES

178. The Old Provinces. Some of the districts which the kings of France brought under their sway, like Languedoc, Provence, Brittany, and Dauphiny, were considerable states in themselves, each with its own laws, customs, and system of government. When these provinces had come, at different times, into the possession of the king of France, he had not changed their laws so as to make them correspond with those of his other domains. He was satisfied if a new province paid its due share

of the taxes and treated his officials with respect. In some cases the provinces retained their local assemblies and controlled, to a certain extent, their own affairs. The provinces into which France was divided before the Revolution were not, therefore, merely artificial divisions created for the purposes of convenience, like the modern French *départements* (see § 218 below), but represented real historical differences. Their inhabitants generally spoke different dialects, or, as in Brittany and parts of Provence, different languages.

**179. Confused Laws and Taxes.** While in a considerable portion of southern France the Roman law still prevailed, in the central parts and in the west and north there were no less than two hundred and eighty-five different local codes of law in force; so that one who moved from his own to a neighboring town might find a wholly unfamiliar set of laws.

One of the heaviest taxes was that on salt. This varied so greatly in different parts of France that the government had to go to great expense to guard the boundary lines between the various districts, for there was every inducement to smugglers to carry salt from those parts of the country where it was cheap into the regions where it sold for a high price on account of the tax.

## II. THE PRIVILEGED CLASSES: THE THIRD ESTATE

**180. The Privileged Classes.** Besides these unfortunate local differences, there were class differences which caused great discontent. All Frenchmen did not enjoy the same rights as citizens. Two small but very important classes, the nobility and the clergy, were treated differently by the State from the rest of the people. They did not have to pay one of the heaviest of the taxes, the notorious *taille*; and on one ground or another they escaped other burdens which the rest of the citizens bore. For instance, they were not required to serve in the militia or help build the roads.

**181. Position of the Clergy.** We have seen how great and powerful the Medieval Church was. In France, as in other Catholic countries of Europe, it still retained in the eighteenth century a considerable part of the power that it had possessed in the

thirteenth, and it still performed important public duties. It took charge of education and of the relief of the sick and the poor. It was very wealthy and is supposed to have owned one fifth of all the land in France. The clergy claimed that their property, being dedicated to God, was not subject to taxation. They consented, however, to help the king from time to time by a "free gift," as they called it. The Church still collected the tithes from the people, and its vast possessions made it very independent (see § 111).

A great part of the enormous income of the Church went to the higher clergy—the bishops, archbishops, and abbots. Since these were appointed by the king, often from among his courtiers, they tended to neglect their duties as officers of the Church and to become little more than "great lords with a hundred thousand francs income." But while they were spending their time at Versailles the real work was performed—and well performed—by the lower clergy, who often received scarcely enough to keep soul and body together. This explains why, when the Revolution began, the parish priests sided with the people instead of with their church superiors.

**182. The Feudal Dues.** The privileges of the nobles, like those of the clergy, had originated in medieval times. It was quite common for the noble landowner to have a right to a certain portion of the peasant's crops; occasionally he could still collect a toll on sheep and cattle driven past his house. In some cases the lord maintained, as he had done in the Middle Ages, the only mill, wine press, or oven within a certain district, and could require everyone to make use of these and pay him a share of the product. Even when a peasant owned his land, the neighboring lord usually had the right to exact one fifth of its value every time it was sold.

**183. The Hunting Rights.** The nobles, too, enjoyed the exclusive privilege of hunting, which was deemed an aristocratic pastime. The game which they preserved for their amusement often did great damage to the crops of the peasants, who were forbidden to interfere with hares and deer. Many of the manors had great pigeon houses, built in the form of a tower, in which



there were one or two thousand nests. No wonder the peasants detested these, for they were not permitted to protect themselves against the innumerable pigeons, which spread over the fields, devouring newly sown seed. These dovecotes constituted, in fact, one of the chief grievances of the peasants.

**184. High Offices monopolized by the Nobles.** The higher offices in the army were reserved for the nobles, as well as the



FIG. 19. A CHÂTEAU AND PIGEON HOUSE

The round tower at the right hand in front is a pigeon house. The wall inside is honeycombed with nests, and the pigeons fly in and out of the windows on each side of the roof

easiest and most profitable places in the Church and about the king's person. All these privileges were remains of the powers which the nobles had enjoyed when they ruled their estates as feudal lords. Louis XIV had, as we know, induced them to leave their domains and gather round him at Versailles, where all who could afford it lived for at least a part of the year.

Only relatively few of the nobility in the eighteenth century were, however, descendants of the ancient and illustrious feudal families of France. The greater part of them had been ennobled in recent times by the king, or had purchased or inherited a



A STREET SCENE IN CANNES IN SOUTHERN FRANCE, SHOWING THE NARROW STREETS ORIGINATING IN THE MIDDLE AGES



government office or judgeship which carried the privileges of nobility with it. The fact that so many nobles were upstarts rendered the rights and exemptions claimed by the nobility more odious to the people at large than they would otherwise have been.

185. **The Third Estate.** Everybody who did not belong to either the clergy or the nobility was regarded as being of the *Third Estate*. The Third Estate was therefore really the nation



FIG. 20. COURT SCENE AT VERSAILLES

The king is surrounded by princes of the royal family and the greatest nobles of France while he is dressed and shaved upon rising in the morning (the *levée*). Similar ceremonies were performed when the king went to bed at night (the *couchée*). The door at the left leads into a small room—called the Bull's Eye Room from the round window above the door—where the ambassadors and other dignitaries waited to be admitted, and while waiting often planned and plotted how to win the king's favor. Louis XIV's bedroom at Versailles is still preserved, in much of its old-time splendor; for the palace is now a museum and is open to the public

at large, which was made up in 1789 of about twenty-five million souls. The privileged classes can scarcely have counted altogether more than two hundred or two hundred and fifty thousand individuals. A great part of the Third Estate lived in the country and tilled the soil.



**186. Favorable Condition of the Peasantry.** Most historians have been inclined to make out the condition of the farming classes as very wretched. They were certainly oppressed by an abominable system of taxation and were irritated by the dues which they had to pay to the lords. They also suffered from local famines. Yet there is no doubt that the evils of their situation have been exaggerated, because it has commonly been thought that the Revolution was to be explained by the misery and despair of the people, who could bear their burdens no longer. If, however, instead of comparing the situation of the French peasant under the old régime with that of an English or American farmer to-day, we contrast his position with that of his fellow peasant in Prussia, Russia, Austria, Italy, or Spain, in the eighteenth century, it will be clear that in France the agricultural classes were really much better off than elsewhere on the Continent. In almost all the other European countries, except England, the peasants were still serfs: they had to work certain days in each week for their lord; they could not marry or dispose of their land without his permission. Moreover, the fact that the population of France had steadily increased from seventeen millions after the close of the wars of Louis XIV to about twenty-five millions at the opening of the Revolution indicates that the general condition of the people was improving rather than growing worse.

**187. Exceptional Misery not the Reason for the Revolution.** The real reason why France was the first among the European countries to carry out a great reform and do away with the irritating survivals of feudalism was not that the nation was miserable and oppressed above all others, but that it was sufficiently prosperous and enlightened to realize the evils of the old régime. The French peasant no longer looked up to his lord as his ruler and protector, but viewed him as a sort of legalized robber who demanded a share of his precious harvest, whose officers awaited the farmer at the crossing of the river to claim a toll, who would not let him sell his produce when he wished, or permit him to protect his fields from the ravages of the pigeons which it pleased his lord to keep.

### III. POWERS OF THE FRENCH KING: THE PARLEMENTS

**188. Despotism Character of the Monarchy.** In the eighteenth century France was still the despotism that Louis XIV had made it. Louis XVI once described it very well in the following words: "The sovereign authority resides exclusively in my person. To me solely belongs the power of making the laws, and without dependence or coöperation. The entire public order emanates from me, and I am its supreme protector. My people are one with me. The rights and interests of the nation are necessarily identical with mine and rest solely in my hands." In short, the king still ruled "by the grace of God," as Louis XIV had done. The following illustrations will make clear the dangerous extent of the king's power.

**189. The King's Control of the Treasury.** In the first place, it was he who levied each year the heaviest of the taxes, the hated *taille*, from which the privileged classes were exempted. This tax brought in about one sixth of the whole revenue of the State. The amount collected was kept secret, and no report was made to the nation of what was done with it or, for that matter, with any other part of the king's income. Indeed, no distinction was made between the king's private funds and the State treasury, whereas in England the monarch was given a stated allowance. The king of France could issue as many drafts payable to bearer as he wished; the royal officials must pay all such orders and ask no questions. Louis XV is said to have spent no less than seventy million dollars in this irresponsible fashion in a single year.

**190. Arbitrary Imprisonment.** But the king not only controlled his subjects' purses; he had a terrible authority over their persons as well. He could issue orders for the arrest and imprisonment of anyone he pleased. Without trial or formality of any sort a person might be cast into a dungeon for an indefinite period, until the king happened to remember him again or was reminded of him by the poor man's friends. These notorious orders of arrest were called *lettres de cachet*; that is, "sealed letters." They were not difficult to obtain for anyone who had influence with the king

or his favorites, and they furnished a particularly easy and efficacious way of disposing of a personal enemy. Some of the most eminent men of the time were shut up by the king's order, often on account of books or pamphlets written by them which displeased the king or those about him.

**191. Limitations on the Monarchy—the Parlements.** Yet, notwithstanding the seemingly unlimited powers of the French king, and in spite of the fact that France had no written constitution and no legislative body to which the nation sent representatives, the monarch was by no means absolutely free to do just as he pleased. In the first place, the high courts of law, the so-called *parlements*, could often hamper the king.

These resembled the English Parliament in almost nothing but name. The French *parlements*—of which the most important one was at Paris and a dozen more were scattered about the provinces—did not, however, confine themselves solely to the business of trying lawsuits. They claimed, and quite properly, that when the king decided to make a new law he must send it to them to be registered, for how, otherwise, could they adjust their decisions to it? Now, although they acknowledged that the right to make the laws belonged to the monarch, they nevertheless often sent a "protest" to the king, instead of registering an edict which they disapproved. They would urge that the ministers had abused his Majesty's confidence. They would also take pains to have their protest printed and sold on the streets at a penny or two a copy, so that people should get the idea that the *parlement* was defending the nation against the oppressive measures of the king's ministers.

When the king received one of these protests two alternatives were open to him. He might recall the distasteful decree altogether, or modify it so as to suit the court; or he could summon the *parlement* before him and in a solemn session (called a *lit de justice*) command it with his own mouth to register the law in its records. The *parlement* would then reluctantly obey; but as the Revolution approached, it began to claim that a decree registered against its will was not valid.

**192. The *Parlements* prepare the Way for the Revolution.** Struggles between the *parlements* and the king's ministers were very frequent in the eighteenth century. They prepared the way for the Revolution, first, by bringing important questions to the attention of the people; for there were no newspapers, and no parliamentary or congressional debates, to enable the public to understand the policy of the government. Secondly, the *parlements* not only frankly criticized the proposed measures of the king and his ministers, but they familiarized the nation with the idea that the king was not really at liberty to alter what they called "the fundamental laws" of the State. By this they meant that there was an unwritten constitution, which limited the king's power and of which they were the guardians. In this way they promoted the growing discontent with a government which was carried on in secret and which left the nation at the mercy of the men in whom the king might for the moment repose confidence.

**193. Public Opinion.** In addition to the *parlements* public opinion often exercised a powerful check upon the king, even under the autocratic old régime. It was, as one of Louis XVI's ministers declared, "an invisible power which, without treasury, guards, or an army, ruled Paris and the court,—yes, the very palace of the king." The latter half of the eighteenth century was a period of outspoken and bitter criticism of the whole existing social and governmental system.

Although there were no daily newspapers to discuss public questions, large numbers of pamphlets were written and circulated by individuals whenever there was an important crisis, and they answered much the same purpose as the editorials in a modern newspaper. We have already seen how French philosophers and reformers, like Voltaire and Diderot, had been encouraged by the freedom of speech which prevailed in England, and how industriously they had sown the seeds of discontent in their own country. We have seen how in popular works, in poems and stories and plays, and above all in the *Encyclopædia*, they explained the new scientific discoveries, attacked the old beliefs and misapprehensions, and encouraged progress.



#### IV. HOW LOUIS XVI TRIED TO PLAY THE BENEVOLENT DESPOT

**194. Death of Louis XV.** In 1774 Louis XV<sup>1</sup> died, after a very long and very disgraceful reign, of which it has not seemed necessary to say much. His unsuccessful wars, especially the Seven



FIG. 21. LOUIS XVI

Louis was a well-meaning man, but possessed little energy or ability and did not understand the needs of France. His clever, strong-willed queen, Marie Antoinette, was responsible for most of the few things he did to try to stop the Revolution, and she was too impulsive to listen to wise advice

Years' War, which had ended in 1763 with the loss of all his American possessions and the victory of his enemies in India, had brought France to the verge of bankruptcy. The taxes were so oppressive as to arouse universal discontent, and yet the government was running behind seventy millions of dollars a year. The king's personal conduct was scandalous; he drew vast sums from the public treasury to meet the expenses of his evil ways, and he allowed his women favorites and courtiers to meddle in public affairs and plunder the royal treasury for themselves and their friends. When at last he was carried off by smallpox there were few to mourn his departure.

Everyone hailed, with hopes of better times, the accession of his grandson and successor, Louis XVI, a person of an entirely different type.

<sup>1</sup> He came to the throne in 1715 as a boy of five, on the death of Louis XIV, his great-grandfather.

**195. Character of Louis XVI.** The new king was but twenty years old, ill educated, indolent, unsociable, and very fond of hunting and of pottering about in a workshop, where he spent his happiest hours. He was a well-meaning young man, with none of his grandfather's vices, who tried now and then to attend to the disagreeable business of government, and would gladly have made his people happy if that had not required more energy than he possessed. He had none of the restless interest in public affairs that we found in Peter the Great, Catherine II, or his brother-in-law, Joseph II; he was never tempted to rise at five o'clock in the morning in order to read State papers and transact public business.



FIG. 22. MARIE ANTOINETTE

**196. Marie Antoinette.** His wife was the beautiful Marie Antoinette, daughter of Maria Theresa. The marriage had been arranged in 1770 with a view to maintaining the alliance which had been concluded between France and Austria in 1756 (§ 51). The queen was only

nineteen years old when she came to the throne, light-hearted and on pleasure bent. She disliked the formal etiquette of the court at Versailles and shocked people by her thoughtless pranks. She rather despised her heavy husband, who did not care to share in the amusements which pleased her best. She did not hesitate to interfere in the government when she wished to help one of her favorites or to make trouble for someone she disliked. She was in the beginning popular with the French people but later became involved in grave scandals.

**197. Turgot's Efforts at Reform (1774-1776).** At first Louis XVI took his duties very seriously. It seemed for a time that he might find a place among the benevolent despots who were

then ruling in Europe. He almost immediately placed the ablest of all the French economists, Turgot, in the most important of the government offices, that of controller general. Turgot was an

experienced government official as well as a scholar.

The first and the most natural measure was economy, for only in that way could the government be saved from bankruptcy and the burden of taxation lightened. Turgot naturally urged that the vast amount expended in maintaining the luxury of the royal court at Versailles should be re-

duced. The establishments of the king, the queen, and the princes of the blood royal cost the State annually about

twelve million dollars. Then the French king had long been accustomed to grant "pensions" in a reckless manner to his favorites, and this required nearly twelve million dollars more.

**198. Resistance of the Privileged Classes to Reform.** Any attempt, however, to reduce this amount would arouse the immediate

écrire deux jours de  
 suite à la toilette n'ayant  
 pas d'autre temps à moi  
 et si je ne lui répond  
 pas exactement quelle  
 croyez que c'est par trop  
 exatitude à beuler sa  
 lettre. Il faut que je  
 finisse pour m'habiller  
 et aller à la messe  
 du Roi j'ai l'honneur  
 d'être  
 choyé ce 12 juillet  
 1770 la plus soumise  
 fille Antoinette  
 se lui envoie  
 la liste des présents  
 que j'ai reçu croyant  
 que cela pourroit amuser

FIG. 23. A LETTER OF MARIE ANTOINETTE

A page of a letter written July 12, 1770, to her mother, Maria Theresa. The handwriting, mistakes in spelling, and general carelessness show what an undeveloped girl she was when she came to the gay court of Versailles. She says in the letter that she has no time to write except while she is dressing. Now she must stop in order to dress and go to the king's mass

opposition of the courtiers, and it was the courtiers who really governed France. They had every opportunity to influence the king's mind against a man whose economies they disliked. They were constantly about the monarch from the moment when he awoke in the morning until he went to bed at night; therefore they had an obvious advantage over Turgot, who saw him only in business hours.




FIG. 24. TURGOT

Turgot was the one great enlightened statesman of the time who might have saved France from a revolution. His frankness displeased the king, however, for he lectured him like a schoolmaster. The queen and the gay courtiers of Versailles brought about his fall

obstacles and rogues at every turn. Public credit will fall; he will be detested; it will be said that he is not fitted for his task. Enthusiasm will cool; he will retire or be sent off, and we shall have a new proof of the mistake of filling a position like his in a monarchy like yours with an upright man and a philosopher." The Italian could not have made a more accurate statement of the case had he waited until after the dismissal of Turgot, which took place in May, 1776, much to the satisfaction of the court.

**199. Necker's Financial Report.** Necker, who after a brief interval succeeded Turgot, contributed to the progress of the coming revolution in two ways. He borrowed vast sums of money in order to carry on the war which France, as the ally of the United



States, had undertaken against England (§ 85). This embarrassed the treasury later and helped to produce the financial crisis which was an immediate cause of the Revolution. Secondly, he gave the nation its first opportunity of learning what was done with the public funds, by presenting to the king (February, 1781) a *report* on the financial condition of the kingdom; this was publicly printed and eagerly read. There the people could see for the first time how much the *taille* and the salt tax actually took from them, and how much the king spent on himself and his favorites.

**200. Calonne and Bankruptcy at Last.** Necker was soon followed by Calonne, who may be said to have precipitated the French Revolution. He was very popular at first with king and courtiers, for he spent the public funds far more recklessly than his predecessors. But, naturally, he soon found himself in a position where he could obtain no more money. The *parlements* would consent to no more loans in a period of peace, and the taxes were as high as it was deemed possible to make them. At last Calonne, finding himself desperately put to it, informed the astonished king that the State was on the verge of bankruptcy, and that in order to save it a thorough reformation of the methods of government was necessary. This report of Calonne's may be taken as the beginning of the French Revolution, for it was the first of the series of events that led to the calling of a representative assembly which abolished the old régime and gave France a written constitution.

### QUESTIONS

I. How should the French Revolution be distinguished from the Reign of Terror? What is the meaning of the "old régime"? Why was France so ill organized in the eighteenth century? Give some examples of the differences which existed between the various provinces.

II. Who were the privileged classes, and what were their privileges? Give examples of the feudal dues. In what respects was the French peasant more happily situated than his fellows in other parts of Europe?

III. What were the chief powers of the French monarch? What were *lettres de cachet*? What limitations were placed upon the king's

power? What did the *parlements* do to forward the coming revolution? What is meant by "public opinion," and what chances does it have to express itself to-day that it did not have in France before the Revolution?

IV. Describe the character of Louis XVI. Tell something of his wife. Why did Turgot fail to remedy any of the existing evils? What happened under Necker to forward the Revolution? Why was Calonne forced to admit that he could not carry on the government unless reforms were introduced?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) some of the evils of the old régime in France, pp. 225-233; (2) Louis XVI as a benevolent despot, pp. 235-240; (3) France's interest in the American Revolution, pp. 242-244; (4) the reforms of Necker, pp. 244-247.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Louis XVI, Turgot, Necker, Calonne, Versailles, and Condorcet.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the French monarchy, pp. 449-451; (2) the confusion in French administration, pp. 451-454; (3) the disordered finances, pp. 454-458; (4) Louis XVI, pp. 458-461.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

#### I. HOW THE ESTATES WERE SUMMONED IN 1789

201. **Reforms proposed by Calonne.** It was necessary, in order to avoid ruin, Calonne claimed, "to reform everything vicious in the State." He proposed, therefore, to reduce the *taille*, reform the salt tax, do away with the interior customs lines, correct the evils of the guilds, etc. But the chief reform, and by far the most difficult one, was to force the privileged classes to surrender their important exemptions from taxation. He hoped, however, that if certain concessions were made to them they might be brought to consent to a land tax to be paid by all alike. So he proposed to the king that he should summon an assembly of persons prominent in Church and State, called *Notables*, to ratify certain changes which would increase the prosperity of the country and give the treasury money enough to meet the necessary expenses.

202. **Summoning of the Notables (1786).** The summoning of the Notables in 1786 was really a revolution in itself. It was a confession on the part of the king that he found himself in a predicament from which he could not escape without the aid of his people. The Notables whom he selected—bishops, archbishops, dukes, judges, high government officials—were practically all members of the privileged classes; but they still represented the nation, after a fashion, as distinguished from the king's immediate circle of courtiers. At any rate it proved an easy step from calling the Notables to summoning the ancient Estates General, and that, in its turn, speedily became a modern representative body.

203. **Calonne denounces the Existing Evils.** In his opening address Calonne gave the Notables an idea of the sad financial condition of the country. The government was running behind

some forty million dollars a year. He could not continue to borrow, and economy, however strict, would not suffice to cover the deficit. "What, then," he asked, "remains to fill this frightful void and enable us to raise the revenue to the desired level? *The existing evils!* Yes, gentlemen, the abuses offer a source of wealth which the state should appropriate, and which should serve to reestablish order in the finances. . . . The wrongs which must now be done away with for the welfare of the people are the most important and the best guarded of all, the very ones which have the deepest roots and the most spreading branches. For example, those which weigh on the laboring classes,—the privileges, exceptions to the law, which should be the same for all, and many an unjust exemption which can only relieve certain taxpayers by embittering the condition of others; the general want of uniformity in the assessment of the taxes and the enormous difference which exists between the contributions of different provinces and of the subjects of the same sovereign;"—all these evils, which public-spirited citizens had long denounced, Calonne proposed to abolish forthwith.

**204. Calonne and the Notables dismissed.** The Notables, however, had no confidence in Calonne, and refused to ratify his program of reform. The king then dismissed him and soon sent them home, too (May, 1787). Louis XVI then attempted to carry through some of the more pressing financial reforms in the usual way by sending them to the *parlements* to be registered (§ 191 above).

**205. The *Parlement* calls for the Estates General.** The *parlement* of Paris resolved, as usual, to make trouble for the king's ministry and gain popularity for itself. This time it resorted to a truly extraordinary measure. It not only refused to register two new taxes which the king desired but asserted that "*Only the nation assembled in the Estates General can give the consent necessary to the establishment of a permanent tax.*" "Only the nation," the *parlement* continued, "after it has learned the true state of the finances can destroy the great evils and open up important resources." This declaration was followed in a few days by the



humble request that the king assemble the Estates General of his kingdom. The *parlements* not only refused to register the new taxes but continued during the following months to do everything that they could to embarrass the king's ministers. There seemed no other resort except to call the representatives of the people together. The Estates General were accordingly summoned to meet at the opening of May, 1789.

**206. The Old System of Voting by Classes in the Estates General.** It was now discovered that no one knew much about this body of which everyone was talking, for it had not met since 1614. The king accordingly issued a general invitation to scholars to find out all they could about the customs observed in the former meetings of the Estates. The public naturally became very much interested in a matter which touched them so closely, and there were plenty of readers for the pamphlets which now began to appear in great numbers. The old Estates General had been organized in a way appropriate enough to the feudal conditions under which they originated (Vol. I, § 566). All three of the estates of the realm—clergy, nobility, and the Third Estate—were accustomed to send an *equal* number of representatives, who were expected to consider not the interests of the nation but the special interests of the particular social class to which they respectively belonged. Accordingly, the deputies of the three estates did not sit together, or vote as a single body. The members of each group first came to an agreement among themselves, and then a single vote was cast for the whole order.

**207. Objections to this System.** It was natural that this system should seem preposterous to the average Frenchman in 1788. If the Estates should be summoned according to the ancient forms, the two privileged classes would together have twice the number of representatives allotted to the nation at large. What was much worse, it seemed impossible that any important reforms could be adopted in an assembly where those who had every selfish reason for opposing the most necessary changes were given two votes out of three. Necker (§ 199), whom the king had recalled in the hope that he might succeed in adjusting the finances, agreed

that the Third Estate should have as many deputies as both the other orders put together, namely six hundred, but he would not consent to having the three orders sit and vote together like a modern representative body.

**208. The *Cahiers*.** Besides the great question as to whether the deputies should vote *by head* or *by order*, the pamphlets discussed what reforms the Estates should undertake. We have, however, a still more interesting and important expression of public opinion in France at this time, in the *cahiers* (pronounced *kā-yā'*), or lists of grievances and suggestions for reform which, in pursuance of an old custom, the king asked the nation to prepare. Each village and town throughout France had an opportunity to tell quite frankly exactly what it suffered from the existing system, and what reforms it wished that the Estates General might bring about. These *cahiers* were the "last will and testament" of the old régime, and they constitute a unique historical document. No one can read the *cahiers* without seeing that the whole nation was ready for the great transformation which within a year was to destroy a great part of the social and political system under which the French had lived for centuries.

**209. Desire of the Nation for a Constitutional Monarchy.** Almost all the *cahiers* agreed that the prevailing disorder and the vast and ill-defined powers of the king and his ministers were perhaps the fundamental evils. One of the *cahiers* says: "Since arbitrary power has been the source of all the evils which afflict the State, our first desire is the establishment of a really national constitution, which shall define the rights of all and provide the laws to maintain them." No one dreamed at this time of displacing the king or of taking the government out of his hands. The people only wished to change an absolute monarchy into a limited, or constitutional, one. All that was necessary was that the things which the government might *not* do should be solemnly and permanently settled and put upon record, and that the Estates General should meet regularly to impose the taxes, give the king advice in national crises, and protest, if necessary, against any violations of the proposed charter of liberties.




FIG. 25. THE OPENING OF THE ESTATES GENERAL, MAY 5, 1789\*



210. The Estates General meet, May 5, 1789. With these ideas in mind, the Estates assembled in Versailles and held their first session on May 5, 1789. The king had ordered the deputies to wear the same costumes that had been worn at the last meeting of the Estates in 1614; but no royal edict could call back the spirit of earlier centuries. In spite of the king's commands the representatives of the Third Estate refused to organize themselves in the old way as a *separate* order. They sent invitation after invitation to the deputies of the clergy and nobility, requesting them to join the people's representatives and discuss with them the great interests of the nation.

211. The Third Estate declare themselves a "National Assembly." Some of the more liberal of the nobles—Lafayette, for example—and a large minority of the clergy wished to meet with the deputies of the Third Estate. But they were outvoted, and the deputies of the Third Estate, losing patience, finally declared themselves, on June 17, a "National Assembly." They argued that, since they represented at least 96 per cent of the nation, the deputies of the privileged orders might be neglected altogether. This usurpation of power on the part of the Third Estate transformed the old feudal Estates, voting by orders, into the first modern national representative assembly on the continent of Europe.

212. The "Tennis-Court" Oath. Under the influence of his courtiers the king tried to restore the old system by arranging a solemn joint session of the three orders, at which he presided in person. He presented a long program of excellent reforms, and then bade the Estates sit apart, according to the old custom. But it was like bidding water to run uphill. Three days before, when the commons had found themselves excluded from their regular place of meeting on account of the preparations for the royal session, they had betaken themselves to a neighboring building called

\* The clergy, as the First Estate of the realm, are seated on the right of the king; the nobles, or Second Estate, on the left; the representatives of the Third Estate, clad in sober black, are given what places remain. The princes of the blood are on the platform. Necker, the minister, is making his speech by the table below the throne.



the "Tennis Court." Here, on June 20, they took the famous "Tennis-Court" oath, "to come together wherever circumstances may dictate, until the constitution of the kingdom shall be established."

213. **The Nobility and Clergy join the Third Estate.** Consequently, when the king finished his address and commanded the



FIG. 26. MIRABEAU

Count Mirabeau was the greatest statesman and orator of the French Revolution. He tried to establish a limited monarchy like that of England. But he had led a scandalous life as a young man, and people were suspicious of his designs and ambition. He died early in 1791 without accomplishing his plans

three orders to disperse immediately in order to resume their separate sessions, most of the bishops, some of the parish priests, and a great part of the nobility obeyed; the rest sat still, uncertain what they should do. When the master of ceremonies ordered them to comply with the king's commands, Mirabeau, the most distinguished statesman among the deputies, told him bluntly that they would not leave their places except at the point of the bayonet. The weak king almost immediately gave in, and a few days later ordered all the deputies of the privileged orders who had not already done so to join the commons.

This was a momentous victory. The representatives of the privileged classes had been forced to unite with the Third Estate, to deliberate with them, and to vote "by head." Moreover the National Assembly had pledged itself not to disperse before it had given France a constitution. It did not propose merely to vote new taxes to help the king's treasury out of its difficulties.

## II. FIRST REFORMS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, JULY TO OCTOBER, 1789

**214. The Fall of the Bastille, July 14, 1789.** The National Assembly now began in earnest the great task of preparing a constitution and regenerating France. It was soon interrupted, however, by events at Paris. The king had been advised by those about him to gather together the Swiss and German troops who formed the royal guard, so that if he decided to send the insolent deputies home he would be able to put down any disorder which might result. He was also induced to dismiss Necker, who enjoyed a popularity that he had done little to merit. When the people of Paris saw the troops gathering and when they heard of the dismissal of Necker, there was general excitement and some disorder.

On July 14 crowds of people assembled, determined to procure arms to protect themselves and mayhap to perform some daring "deed of patriotism." One of the bands, led by the old Parisian guards, turned to the ancient fortress of the Bastille. The castle had long had a bad reputation as a place of confinement for prisoners of State and for those imprisoned by *lettres de cachet* (§ 190). When the mob demanded admission, it was naturally denied them, and they were fired upon and nearly a hundred were killed. After a brief, courageous attack the place was surrendered, and the mob rushed into the gloomy pile. They found only seven prisoners, but one poor fellow had lost his wits and another had no idea why he had been kept there for years. The captives were freed amidst great enthusiasm, and the people soon set to work to demolish the walls.

**215. The "National Guard."** The anniversary of the fall of the Bastille is still celebrated as the great national holiday of France. The rising of the people to protect themselves against the schemes of the king's advisers who, it was believed, wished to block reform, and the successful attack on a monument of ancient tyranny appeared to be the opening of a new era of freedom. The disorders of these July days led to the formation

of the "national guard." This was made up of volunteers from among the more prosperous citizens, who organized themselves to maintain order and so took from the king every excuse for calling in the regular troops for that purpose. Lafayette was put in command of this body.

**216. Communes in Paris and Other Cities.** The government of Paris was reorganized, and a mayor, chosen from among the members of the National Assembly, was put at the head of the new *Commune*, as the municipal government was called. The other cities of France also began with one accord, after the dismissal of Necker and the fall of the Bastille, to promote the Revolution by displacing their old royal or aristocratic governments by committees of their citizens. These improvised communes, or city governments, established national guards, as Paris had done, and thus maintained order. The Commune of Paris later played a very important rôle in the Reign of Terror.

**217. Abolition of Serfdom and Feudalism, August, 1789.** About the first of August news began to reach the National Assembly of serious disorders in the provinces. In some cases the peasants burned the country houses of the nobles so as to destroy the registers enumerating the feudal dues. This led to the first important reforms of the Assembly. A momentous resolution abolishing the survivals of serfdom and other institutions of feudalism was passed in a night session (August 4-5) amid great excitement. The representatives of the privileged orders vied with each other in surrendering the ancient privileges they could no longer keep. The exclusive right of the nobility to hunt and to maintain pigeon houses was abolished, and the peasant was permitted to kill game which he found on his land. The tithes of the Church were done away with. The former exemptions of the privileged classes from the payment of certain taxes were abolished forever. It was decreed that "taxes shall be collected from all citizens and from all property in the same manner and in the same form," and that "all citizens, without distinction of birth, are eligible to any office or dignity." Moreover, "all the peculiar privileges, pecuniary or otherwise, of the provinces, principalities,






FIG. 27. THE TAKING OF THE BASTILLE



districts, cantons, cities and communes, are once for all abolished and are absorbed into the law common to all Frenchmen."

**218. Abolition of the Ancient Provinces.** This decree established the equality and uniformity for which the French people had sighed so long. The injustice of the former system of taxation could never be reintroduced. All France was to have the same laws, and its citizens were henceforth to be treated in the same way by the State, whether they lived in Brittany or Dauphiny. The Assembly soon went a step farther in consolidating and unifying France. It wiped out the old provinces altogether, by dividing the whole country into districts of convenient size, called *departments*. These were much more numerous than the ancient divisions, and were named after rivers and mountains. This wiped from the map all traces of the old feudal disunion.

**219. Declaration of the Rights of Man.** Many of the *cahiers* had suggested that the Estates should draw up a clear statement of the rights of the individual citizen. The National Assembly consequently determined to prepare such a declaration in order to reassure the people and to form a basis for the new constitution.

This Declaration (completed August 26) is one of the most notable documents in the history of Europe. It not only aroused general enthusiasm when it was first published, but it appeared over and over again, in a modified form, in the succeeding French constitutions down to 1848, and has been the model for similar declarations in many of the other European states. It was a dignified repudiation of the wrongs described in the preceding chapter. Behind each article there was some crying evil of long standing against which the people wished to be forever protected.

**220. Contents of the Declaration.** The Declaration sets forth that "Men are born and remain equal in rights. Social distinctions can only be founded upon the general good." "Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate, personally or through his representatives, in its formation. It must be the same for all." "No person shall be accused, arrested, or imprisoned except in the cases and according to the forms established by law." "No one shall be disquieted on account of his

opinions, including his religious views, provided that their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law." "The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, being responsible, however, for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law." "All citizens have a right to decide, either personally or by their representatives, as to the necessity of the public contribution, to grant this freely, to know to what uses it is put, and to fix the proportion, the mode of assessment and of collection, and the duration of the taxes." "Society has the right to require of every government agent an account of his administration." Well might the Assembly claim, in a later address to the people, that "the rights of man had been misconceived and insulted for centuries," and boast that they were "reëstablished for all humanity in this declaration, which shall serve as an everlasting war cry against oppressors."

### III. THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY IN PARIS, OCTOBER, 1789, TO SEPTEMBER, 1791

**221. Suspicion aroused against the Court.** The king hesitated to ratify the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and about the first of October rumors became current that, under the influence of the courtiers, he was calling together troops and preparing for another attempt to put an end to the Revolution, similar to that which the attack on the Bastille had frustrated. It was said that the new national colors—red, white, and blue—had been trampled under foot at a banquet at Versailles. These things, along with the scarcity of food due to the poor crops of the year, aroused the excitable Paris populace.

**222. A Mob carries the King to Paris.** On October 5 several thousand women and a number of armed men marched out to Versailles to ask bread of the king, in whom they had great confidence personally, however suspicious they might be of his friends and advisers. Lafayette marched after the mob with the

national guard to keep order, but did not prevent some of the rabble from invading the king's palace the next morning and nearly murdering the queen, who had become very unpopular. She was believed to be still an Austrian at heart and to be in league with the party which opposed the revolution.

The mob declared that the king must accompany them to Paris, and he was obliged to consent. Far from being disloyal, they assumed that the presence of the royal family would insure



FIG. 28. MARCH OF THE WOMEN TO VERSAILLES

plenty and prosperity. So they gayly escorted the "baker and the baker's wife and the baker's boy," as they jocularly termed the king and queen and the little crown prince, to the Palace of the Tuileries, where the king took up his residence, practically a prisoner, as it proved. The National Assembly soon followed him and resumed its sittings in a riding school near the Tuileries.

This transfer of the king and the Assembly to the capital was the first great misfortune of the Revolution. At a serious crisis the government was placed at the mercy of the leaders of the disorderly elements of Paris. We shall see how the municipal council of Paris finally usurped the powers of the national government.

**223. Confiscation of the Church's Property.** As we have seen, the Church in France was very rich and retained

many of its medieval prerogatives and privileges (§§ 111-112, 133). Its higher officials, the bishops and abbots, received very large revenues and often a single prelate held a number of rich benefices, the duties of which he sadly neglected. The parish priests, on the other hand, who really performed the manifold and important functions of the Church, were scarcely able to live on their incomes. This unjust apportionment of the vast revenue of the Church naturally suggested the idea that the State, if it confiscated the clergy's possessions, could see that those who did the work were properly paid for it, and might, at the same time, secure a handsome sum which would help the government out of its financial troubles.

The tithes had been abolished in August along with the feudal dues. That deprived the Church of perhaps thirty million dollars a year. On November 2 a decree was passed providing that "All the ecclesiastical possessions are at the disposal of the nation on condition that it provides properly for the expenses of maintaining religious services, for the support of those who conduct them and for the succor of the poor." This decree deprived the bishops and priests of their benefices and made them dependent on salaries paid by the State. The monks, monasteries, and convents also lost their property.

**224. The Assignats, or Paper Currency.** The National Assembly resolved (July, 1790) to issue a paper currency for which the newly acquired lands should serve as security. Of these *assignats*, as this paper money was called, about forty billions of francs were issued in the next seven years. But so much land was thrown on the market that they were worth less and less as time went on, and finally a great part of them were officially declared of no value.

**225. Civil Constitution of the Clergy.** The Assembly set to work to reorganize the Church entirely. The anxiety for complete uniformity shows itself in the reckless way that it dealt with this most venerable institution of France, the customs of which were hallowed by age and religious veneration. The one hundred and thirty-four ancient bishoprics, some of which dated back to the Roman Empire, were replaced by the eighty-three new



departments into which France had already been divided. Each of these became the diocese of a bishop, who was looked upon as an officer of the State and was to be elected by the people. The priests, too, were to be chosen by the people, and their salaries were much increased, so that even in the smallest villages they received over twice the minimum amount paid under the old régime.

This Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the first serious mistake on the part of the National Assembly. While the half-feudalized Church had sadly needed reform, the worst evils




FIG. 29. ASSIGNAT. (REDUCED IN SIZE)

This piece of paper money, which resembled the bank note of to-day, was of the face value of 10 *livres*, or francs; but before the Revolution was over it was almost worthless. So many were printed, however, that one can still find copies in old curiosity shops, costing only a few cents

might have been remedied without shocking and offending thousands of those who had hitherto enthusiastically applauded the great reforms which the Assembly had effected. Louis XVI gave his assent to the changes, but with the feeling that he might be losing his soul by so doing. From that time on, he became at heart an enemy of the Revolution.

**226. Harsh Treatment of the "Nonjuring" Clergy.** The discontent with the new system on the part of the clergy led to another serious error on the part of the Assembly. It required the clergy to take an oath to be faithful to the new laws and "to

maintain with all their might the constitution decreed by the Assembly." Only six of the bishops consented to this and but a third of the lower clergy, although they were much better off under the new system. Forty-six thousand parish priests refused to sacrifice their religious scruples, and before long the Pope forbade them to take the required oath to the constitution. As time went on, the "nonjuring" clergy were dealt with more and more harshly by the government, and the way was prepared for the horrors of the Reign of Terror.

#### IV. FRANCE BECOMES INVOLVED IN A WAR WITH OTHER EUROPEAN POWERS

**227. The Permanent Reforms of 1789.** We have now studied the progress and nature of the revolution which destroyed the old régime and created modern France. Through it the unjust privileges, the perplexing irregularities, and the local differences were abolished, and the people were admitted to a share in the government. This vast reform had been accomplished without serious disturbance and, with the exception of some of the changes in the Church, it had been welcomed with enthusiasm by the French nation.

**228. The Second Revolution.** This permanent, peaceful revolution, or reformation, was followed by a second révolution of unprecedented violence, which for a time destroyed the French monarchy. It also introduced a series of further changes, some of which were absurd and unnecessary and could not endure since they were approved by only a few fanatical leaders. France, moreover, became involved in a war with most of the powers of western Europe. The weakness of her government which permitted the forces of disorder and fanaticism to prevail, combined with the pressing danger of an invasion by the united powers of Europe, produced the Reign of Terror.

**229. The Emigration of the Nobles.** While practically the whole of the nation heartily rejoiced in the earlier reforms introduced by the National Assembly and celebrated the general

satisfaction and harmony by a great national festival held at Paris on the first anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, some of the higher nobility refused to remain in France. The king's youngest brother, the count of Artois, set the example by leaving the country. He was followed by others who were terrified or disgusted by the burning of their country houses, the loss of their privileges, and the abolition of hereditary nobility by the National Assembly in June, 1790. Before long these *emigrant nobles* (*émigrés*), among whom were many military officers, organized a little army across the Rhine, and the count of Artois began to plan an invasion of France. He was ready to ally himself with Austria, Prussia, or any other foreign government which he could induce to help undo the Revolution and give back to the French king his former absolute power and to the nobles their old privileges.

The threats and insolence of the emigrant nobles and their shameful negotiations with foreign powers discredited the members of their class who still remained in France. The people suspected that the plans of the runaways met with the secret approval of the king, and more especially of the queen, whose brother was now emperor and ruler of the Austrian dominions. This, added to the opposition of the nonjuring clergy, produced a bitter hostility between the so-called "patriots" and those who, on the other hand, were supposed to be secretly hoping for a counter-revolution which would reëstablish the old régime.

**230. Flight to Varennes, June 21, 1791.** The worst fears of the people appeared to be justified by the secret flight of the royal family from Paris, in June, 1791. Ever since the king had reluctantly signed the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, flight had seemed to him his only resource. There was a body of French troops on the northeastern boundary; if he could escape from Paris and join them he hoped that, aided by a demonstration on the part of the queen's brother, Emperor Leopold II, he might march back and check the further progress of the revolutionary movement with which he could no longer sympathize. He and the queen were, however, arrested on the way, at Varennes, and speedily brought back to Paris.

The desertion of the king appears to have terrified rather than angered the nation. The grief of the people at the thought of losing, and their joy at regaining, a poor, weak ruler like Louis XVI clearly shows that France was still profoundly royalist in its sympathies. The National Assembly pretended that the king had not fled but that he had been carried off. This gratified France at large; still in Paris there were some who thought the king should be deposed, and so for the first time a *republican* party appeared, though it was still small.

**231. The First French Constitution (1791).** The National Assembly at last put the finishing touches to the new constitution upon which it had been working for two years, and the king readily swore to observe it faithfully. All the discord and suspicion of the past months were to be forgotten. The National Assembly had completed its appointed task, perhaps the greatest that a single body of men ever undertook. It had made France over and had given her a written constitution. It was now ready to give way to the regular Legislative Assembly provided for in the constitution. This held its first session October 1, 1791.

**232. Situation at Opening of the Legislative Assembly.** In spite of the great achievements of the National Assembly it left France in a critical situation. Besides the emigrant nobles abroad, there were the nonjuring clergy at home and a king who was secretly corresponding with foreign powers with the hope of securing their aid. When the news of the arrest of the king and



FIG. 30. CARICATURE OF LOUIS XVI AS CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCH<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The formerly despotic king is represented as safely caged by the National Assembly. When asked by Marie Antoinette's brother, the Emperor Leopold, what he is doing, Louis XVI replies, "I am signing my name,"—that is, he had nothing to do except meekly to ratify the measures which the Assembly chose to pass. This condition of a king was intolerable to other monarchs of the Continent.



queen at Varennes reached the ears of Marie Antoinette's brother Leopold, he declared that the violent arrest of the king sealed with unlawfulness all that had been done in France and "compromised directly the honor of all the sovereigns and the security of every government." He therefore proposed to the rulers of Russia, England, Prussia, Spain, Naples, and Sardinia that they should come to some understanding among themselves as to how they might "reëstablish the liberty and honor of the most Christian king and his family, and place a check upon the dangerous excesses of the French Revolution, the fatal example of which it behooves every government to repress."

**233. The Declaration of Pillnitz, August 27, 1791.** On August 27 Emperor Leopold issued, together with the king of Prussia, the famous Declaration of Pillnitz. In this the two sovereigns state that, in accordance with the wishes of the king's brothers (the leaders of the emigrant nobles), they are ready to join the other European rulers in an attempt to place the king of France in a position to establish a form of government "that shall be once more in harmony with the rights of sovereigns and shall promote the welfare of the French nation." In the meantime they promised to prepare their troops for active fighting.

**234. Effect of the Declaration.** The Declaration was little more than an empty threat; but it seemed to the French people a sufficient proof that the monarchs were ready to help the emigrant French nobles to reëstablish the old régime against the wishes of the nation and at the cost of infinite bloodshed. The idea of foreign rulers intermeddling with their affairs would in itself have been intolerable to a proud people like the French, even if the new reforms had not been endangered. Had it been the object of the allied monarchs to hasten instead of to prevent the otherthrow of Louis XVI, they could hardly have chosen a more efficient means than the Declaration of Pillnitz.

**235. The Newspapers.** The general excitement and the enthusiasm for the Revolution were kept up by the newspapers which had been established, especially in Paris, since the meeting of the Estates General. The people did not need longer to rely

upon an occasional pamphlet, as had been the case before 1789. Many journals of the most divergent kinds and representing the most diverse opinions were published. Some were no more than a periodical editorial written by one man; for example, the notorious *Friend of the People*, by the unbalanced Marat. Others, like the famous *Moniteur*, were much like our papers of to-day and contained news, reports of the debates in the Assembly, announcements of theaters, etc. Some of the papers were illustrated, and the representations of contemporaneous events, especially the numerous caricatures, are highly amusing (see Fig. 30, for example).

**236. The Jacobins.** Of the numerous political clubs, by far the most famous was that of the "Jacobins." When the Assembly moved into Paris, some of the representatives of the Third Estate rented a large room in the monastery of the Jacobin monks, not far from the building where the National Assembly itself met. The aim of this society was to discuss questions which were about to come before the National Assembly. The club decided beforehand what should be the policy of its members and how they should vote; and in this way they successfully combined to counteract the schemes of the aristocratic party in the Assembly. The club rapidly grew and soon admitted some who were not deputies to its sessions. In October, 1791, it decided to permit the public to attend its discussions.

Gradually similar societies were formed in the provinces. These joined themselves with the "mother" society at Paris and kept in constant communication with it. In this way the Jacobins of Paris stirred up and controlled public interest throughout France, and kept the opponents of the old régime alert. When the Legislative Assembly met, the Jacobins had not as yet become republicans, but they believed that the king should have hardly more power than the president of a republic.

**237. The Emigrant Nobles declared Traitors.** The growing discord in the nation was increased by the severe edicts that the Legislative Assembly directed against the emigrant nobles and the nonjuring clergy. "The Frenchmen assembled on the frontier" were declared under suspicion of conspiring against their country.

If they did not return to France by January 1, 1792, they were to be regarded as convicted traitors, to be punished, if caught, with death; their property was to be confiscated.

**238. Harsh Measures against Nonjuring Clergy.** The harsh treatment of the emigrant nobles was perhaps justified by their desertion and treasonable intrigues; but the conduct of the Assembly toward the clergy was both unstatesmanlike and iniquitous. Those who had refused to take the oath to support the Civil Constitution of the Clergy were commanded to do so within a week on penalty of losing their income from the State and being watched as suspects. As this failed to bring the clergy to terms, the Assembly later (May, 1792) ordered the deportation from the country of those who persisted in their refusal. In this way the Assembly aroused the active hostility of a great part of the lower clergy, who had loyally supported the commons in their fight against the privileged orders. It also lost the confidence of the great mass of faithful Catholics,—merchants, artisans, and peasants,—who had gladly accepted the abolition of the old evils, but who would not consent to desert their religious leaders.

**239. Beginning of the Revolutionary Wars, April, 1792.** By far the most important act of the Legislative Assembly during the one year of its existence was starting a war between France and Austria. It little dreamed that this was the beginning of a war between revolutionary France and the rest of western Europe which was to last, with slight interruptions, for over twenty years.

To many of the leaders in the Assembly it seemed that the existing conditions were intolerable. The emigrant nobles were forming little armies on the boundaries of France and had, as we have seen, induced Austria and Prussia to consider interfering in French affairs. The Assembly suspected that Louis was negotiating with foreign rulers and would be glad to have them intervene and reestablish him in his old despotic power. The deputies argued, therefore, that a war against the hated Austria would unite the sympathies of the nation and force the king to show his true character; for he would be obliged either to become the nation's leader or show himself the traitor they suspected him to be.

## V. FOUNDING OF THE FIRST FRENCH REPUBLIC

**240. The King suspected of Treason.** It was with a heavy heart that the king, urged on by the clamors of the Assembly, declared war upon Austria in April, 1792. The unpopularity of the king only increased, however. He refused to ratify certain popular measures of the Assembly and dismissed the ministers who had been forced upon him by the Assembly. In June a mob of Parisians invaded the Palace of the Tuileries, and the king might have been killed had he not consented to don the "cap of liberty," the badge of the "citizen patriots."

**241. Growing Demand for a Republic.** When France declared war Prussia immediately allied itself with Austria. Both powers collected their forces and, to the great joy of the emigrant nobles, who joined them, prepared to march upon France. The early attempts of the French to get a footing in the Austrian Netherlands were not successful, and the troops and people accused the nobles, who were in command of the French troops, of treason. As the allies approached the boundaries it became clearer and clearer that the king was utterly incapable of defending France, and the Assembly began to consider the question of deposing him. The duke of Brunswick, who was at the head of the Prussian forces, took the very worst means of helping the king, by issuing a proclamation in which he threatened utterly to destroy Paris should the king suffer any harm.

**242. Insurrection of August 10, 1792.** Angered by this declaration and aroused by the danger, the populace of Paris again invaded the Tuileries, August 10, 1792, and the king was obliged to take refuge in the building in which the Assembly was in session. Those who instigated the attack were men who had set their heart upon doing away with the king altogether and establishing a republic. A group of them had taken possession of the city hall, pushed the old members of the municipal council off from their seats, and taken the government in their own hands. In this way the members of the Paris Commune became the leaders in the new revolution which established the first French republic.



243. France proclaimed a Republic, September 22, 1792. The Assembly agreed with the Commune in desiring a republic. If, as was proposed, France was henceforth to do without a king,



FIG. 31. LOUIS XVI. ON THE ROOF OF HIS PRISON

The prison to which the royal family was taken on August 13 was known as the Temple, because it had been part of the building of the Knights Templar in Paris. It was a gloomy tower with massive walls. It was torn down in 1811

it was obviously necessary that the monarchical constitution so recently completed should be replaced by a republican one. Consequently, the Assembly arranged that the people should elect delegates to a constitutional *Convention*, which should draw up a new system of government. The Convention met on September 21, and its first act was to abolish the ancient monarchy and proclaim France a republic. It seemed to the enthusiasts of the time that a new era of liberty had dawned, now that the long oppression by "despots" was ended forever. The twenty-second day of September, 1792, was reckoned as the first day of the Year One of French liberty.<sup>1</sup>

244. September Massacres (1792). Meanwhile the usurping Paris Commune had taken matters into its own hands and had brought discredit upon the cause of liberty by one of the most atrocious acts in history. On the pretext that Paris was full of traitors who sympathized with the Austrians and the emigrant nobles, they had filled the prisons

<sup>1</sup> A committee of the Convention was appointed to draw up a new republican calendar. The year was divided into twelve months of thirty days each. The five days preceding September 22, at the end of the year, were holidays. Each month was divided into three *decades*, and each "tenth day" (*décadi*) was a holiday. The days were no longer dedicated to saints, but to agricultural implements, vegetables, domestic animals, etc.

with some three thousand citizens. On September 2 and 3 hundreds of these were executed with scarcely a pretense of a trial. The members of the Commune who perpetrated this deed probably hoped to terrify those who might still dream of returning to the old system of government.

**245. Course of the War.** Late in August the Prussians crossed the French boundary and on September 2 took the fortress of Verdun. It now seemed as if there was nothing to prevent their marching upon Paris. The French general Dumouriez blocked their advance, however, and without a pitched battle caused the enemy to retreat. Notwithstanding the fears of the French, the king of Prussia had but little interest in the war; the Austrian troops were lagging far behind, and both powers were much more absorbed in a second partition of Poland (§ 58) which was approaching than in the fate of the French king. The French now invaded Germany and took several important towns on the Rhine, including Mainz, which gladly opened its gates to them. They also occupied the Austrian Netherlands and Savoy.

**246. Trial and Execution of the King, January, 1793.** Meanwhile the new Convention was puzzled to determine what would best be done with the king. A considerable party felt that he was guilty of treason in secretly encouraging the foreign powers to come to his aid. He was therefore brought to trial, and when it came to a final vote, he was, by a small majority, condemned to death. He mounted the scaffold on January 21, 1793, with the fortitude of a martyr. Nevertheless, one cannot but feel that through his earlier weakness and indecision he brought untold misery upon his own kingdom and upon Europe at large. The French people had not dreamed of a republic until his absolute incompetence forced them, in self-defense, to abolish the monarchy in the hope of securing a more efficient government.

**247. France declares War on England, February 1, 1793.** The exultation of the Convention over the conquests which their armies were making encouraged them to offer the assistance of the new republic to any country that wished to establish its freedom by throwing off the yoke of monarchy. They even proposed

a republic to the English people. One of the French ministers declared, "We will hurl thither fifty thousand caps of liberty, we will plant there the sacred tree of liberty." February 1, 1793, France greatly added to her embarrassments by declaring war on England, a country which proved her most inveterate enemy.

**248. French driven from the Netherlands.** The war now began to go against the French. The allies had hitherto been suspicious of one another and fearful lest Russia should take advantage of their preoccupation with France to seize more than her share of Poland. They now came to an agreement.

The adjustment of the differences between the allies gave a wholly new aspect to the war with France. When in March, 1793, Spain and the Holy Roman Empire joined the coalition, France was at war with all her neighbors. The Austrians defeated Dumouriez at Neerwinden and drove the French out of the Netherlands. Thereupon Dumouriez, disgusted by the failure of the Convention to support him and by its execution of the king, deserted to the enemy with a few hundred soldiers who consented to follow him.

## VI. THE REIGN OF TERROR

**249. The Committee of Public Safety, April, 1793.** The loss of the Netherlands and the treason of their best general made a deep impression upon the members of the Convention. If the new French Republic was to defend itself against the "tyrants" without and its many enemies within, it could not wait for the Convention to draw up an elaborate, permanent constitution. An efficient government must be immediately devised to maintain the loyalty of the nation to the Republic and to raise and equip armies and direct their commanders. The Convention accordingly put the government into the hands of a small committee, consisting originally of nine, later of twelve, of its members. This famous Committee of Public Safety was given practically unlimited powers. "We must," one of the leaders exclaimed, "establish the despotism of liberty in order to crush the despotism of kings."

**250. The Girondists.** Within the Convention itself there were two groups of active men who came into bitter conflict over the policy to be pursued. There was, first, the party of the Girondists, so called because their leaders came from the department of Gironde, in which the great city of Bordeaux lay. They were moderate republicans and counted among their numbers some speakers of remarkable eloquence. The Girondists had enjoyed the control of the Legislative Assembly in 1792 and had been active in bringing on the war with Austria and Prussia. They hoped in that way to complete the Revolution by exposing the bad faith of the king and his sympathy with the emigrant nobles. They were not, however, men of sufficient decision to direct affairs in the terrible difficulties in which France found herself after the execution of the king. They consequently lost their influence, and the more radical Jacobins, called the "Mountain" from the high seats that they occupied in the Convention, gained the ascendancy.

**251. The Extreme Republicans, called the "Mountain."** This party was composed of the most vigorous and uncompromising republicans. They believed that the French people had been depraved by the slavery to which their kings had subjected them. Everything, they argued, suggesting the former rule of kings must be wiped out. A new France should be created, in which Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity should take the place of the tyranny of princes, the insolence of nobles, and the exactions of the priests. The leaders of the Mountain held that the mass of the people were by nature good and upright, but that there were a number of adherents of the old system who would, if they could, undo the great work of the Revolution and lead the people back to their former slavery under the king. All who were suspected by the Mountain of having the least sympathy with the nobles or persecuted priests were branded as "counter-revolutionary." The Mountain was willing to resort to any measures, however shocking, to rid the nation of those suspected of counter-revolutionary tendencies, and its leaders relied upon the populace of Paris, which had been disappointed that "liberty"



had not bettered the hard conditions of life as it had hoped, to aid them in reaching their ends.

**252. Girondists expelled from the Convention, June 2, 1793.** The Girondists, on the other hand, abhorred the furious Paris




FIG. 32. DANTON

Danton was in favor of a policy of terror only so long as France was really in peril. He thought that the Terror was necessary in order to suppress rebellion and conspiracies; but when he tried to stop it, Robespierre's party claimed that he had himself turned traitor to the Jacobin ideal, since that was not yet attained

mob and the cruel fanatics who composed the Commune of the capital. They argued that Paris was not France, and that it had no right to assume a despotic rule over the nation. They proposed that the Commune should be dissolved and that the Convention should remove to another town where they would not be subject to the intimidation of the Paris mob. The Mountain thereupon accused the Girondists of an attempt to break up the republic, "one and indivisible," by questioning the supremacy of Paris and the duty of the provinces to follow the lead of the capital. The mob, thus encouraged, rose against the Girondists. On June 2 it surrounded the meeting place of the Convention, and deputies of the

Commune demanded the expulsion from the Convention of the Girondist leaders, who were placed under arrest.

**253. France threatened with Civil War.** The conduct of the Mountain and its ally, the Paris Commune, now began to arouse opposition in various parts of France, and the country was threatened with civil war at a time when it was absolutely necessary that all Frenchmen should combine in the loyal defense of their country

against the invaders who were again approaching its boundaries. The first and most serious opposition came from the peasants of Brittany, especially in the department of La Vendée. There the people still loved the monarchy and their priests and even the nobles; they refused to send their sons to fight for a republic which had killed their king and was persecuting the priests who declined to take an oath which their conscience forbade. The royalists of La Vendée defeated several corps of the national guard which the Convention sent against them, and it was not until autumn that the distinguished general Kléber was able to put down the insurrection.

**254. Revolt of the Cities against the Convention.** The great cities of Marseille and Bordeaux were indignant at the treatment to which the Girondist deputies were subjected in Paris, and organized a revolt against the Convention. In the manufacturing city of Lyon the merchants hated the Jacobins and their republic, since the demand for silk and other luxuries produced at Lyon had come from the nobility and clergy, who were now no longer in a position to buy. The prosperous classes were therefore exasperated when the agents of the Convention demanded money and troops. These citizens gathered an army of ten thousand men and placed it under a royalist leader. The Convention, however, called in troops from the armies on the frontier, bombarded and captured the city, and wreaked a terrible vengeance upon those who had dared to revolt against the Mountain. Frightened by the experience of Lyon, the cities of Bordeaux and Marseille decided that resistance was futile and admitted the troops of the Convention. The Convention's Committee of Public Safety showed itself far more efficient than the scattered and disunited opponents who questioned its right to govern France.

**255. Repulse of the English and Austrians.** While the Committee of Public Safety had been suppressing the revolts within the country, it had taken active measures to meet its foreign enemies. The distinguished military organizer, Carnot, had become a member of the committee in August and immediately called for a general levy of troops. He soon had seven hundred and fifty

thousand men; these he divided into thirteen armies and dispatched them against the allies. The English and Hanoverians, who were besieging Dunkirk, were driven off and the Austrians were defeated, so that by the close of the year 1793 all danger from invasion was past, for the time being at least.

**256. The Revolutionary Tribunal.** In spite of the marvelous success with which the Committee of Public Safety had crushed its opponents at home and repelled the forces of the coalition, it continued its policy of stifling all opposition by terror. Even before the fall of the Girondists a special court had been established in Paris, known as the Revolutionary Tribunal. Its duty was to try all those who were suspected of treasonable acts. At first the cases were very carefully considered, and few persons were condemned.

In September, after the revolt of the cities, two new men, who had had a hand in the September massacres, were added to the Committee of Public Safety. They were selected with the particular purpose of frightening the counter-revolutionary party by bringing all the dissatisfied to the guillotine.<sup>1</sup> A terrible law was passed, declaring all those to be suspects who by their conduct or remarks had shown themselves enemies of liberty. The former nobles, including the wives, fathers, mothers, and children of the "emigrants," unless they had constantly manifested their attachment to the Revolution, were ordered to be imprisoned.

**257. Execution of Marie Antoinette, October, 1793.** In October the queen, Marie Antoinette, after a trial in which false and atrocious charges were brought against her,<sup>2</sup> was executed in Paris, and a number of high-minded and distinguished persons suffered a like fate. But the most horrible acts of the Reign of Terror were perpetrated in the provinces where agents of the

<sup>1</sup> In former times it had been customary to inflict capital punishment by decapitating the victim with the sword. At the opening of the Revolution a certain Dr. Guillotin recommended a new device, which consisted of a heavy knife sliding downward between two uprights. This instrument, called, after him, the guillotine, which is still used in France, was more speedy and certain in its action than the sword in the hands of the executioner.

<sup>2</sup> She had, like the king, been guilty of encouraging the enemies of France to intervene.

Committee of Public Safety were sent with almost absolute military power to crush rebellions. A representative of the Convention had thousands of the people of Nantes shot down or drowned. The Convention proposed to destroy the great city of Lyon altogether, and, though this decree was only partially carried out, thousands of its citizens were executed.<sup>1</sup>

## VII. END OF THE REIGN OF TERROR: THE DIRECTORY

**258. Division in the Party of the Mountain.** Soon the radical party which was conducting the government began to disagree among themselves. Danton, a man of fiery zeal for the republic, who had hitherto enjoyed great popularity with the Jacobins, became tired of bloodshed and believed that the system of terror was no longer necessary. On the other hand, Hébert, the leader of the Commune, felt that the revolution was not yet complete. He proposed, for example, that the worship of Reason should be substituted for the worship of God, and arranged a service in the great church of Notre Dame, where Reason, in the person of a handsome actress, took her place on the altar.

**259. Robespierre as Dictator.** The most powerful member of the Committee of Public Safety was Robespierre, who, although he was insignificant in person and a tiresome speaker, enjoyed a great reputation for "republican virtue." He disapproved alike of Danton's moderation and of the worship of Reason advocated by the Commune. Through his influence the leaders of both the moderate and the extreme party were arrested and executed (March and April, 1794).

**260. Fall of Robespierre, July 27, 1794.** It was, of course, impossible for Robespierre to maintain his dictatorship for long. When he had the Revolutionary Tribunal divided into sections

<sup>1</sup> It should not be forgotten that very few of the people at Paris stood in any fear of the guillotine. The city during the Reign of Terror was not the gloomy place that we might imagine. Never did the inhabitants appear happier, never were the theaters and restaurants more crowded. The guillotine was making away with the enemies of liberty, so the women wore tiny guillotines as ornaments, and the children were given toy guillotines and amused themselves decapitating the figures of "aristocrats."



and greatly increased the rapidity of the executions with a view of destroying all his enemies, his colleagues in the Convention began to fear that he would demand their heads next. A coalition was formed against him, and the Convention ordered his arrest.<sup>1</sup> He



FIG. 33. MAXIMILIEN ROBESPIERRE

Robespierre was an honest, though narrow-minded, man. He sanctioned using terror to force upon France an ideal democracy, with the sad result that for a long time to come Jacobinism and democracy in France suffered from the memory of his acts

was an immediate reaction after his death, for the country was becoming weary of executions. The Revolutionary Tribunal henceforth convicted very few of those who were brought before it. Indeed, it turned upon those who had themselves been the leaders in the worst atrocities; for example, the public prosecutor, who had brought hundreds of victims to the guillotine in Paris, and the brutes who had ordered the massacres at Nantes and

called upon the Commune to defend him, but the Convention roused Paris against the Commune, which was no longer powerful enough to intimidate the whole city, and he and his supporters were sent to the guillotine.

**261. Reaction after the Overthrow of Robespierre.** In successfully overthrowing Robespierre the Convention and Committee of Public Safety had rid the country of the only man who, owing to his popularity and his reputation for uprightness, could have prolonged the Reign of Terror. There

<sup>1</sup> The date of Robespierre's fall is generally known as the Ninth of Thermidor, the day and month of the republican calendar.

Lyon. Within a few months the Jacobin Club at Paris was closed by the Convention, and the Commune was abolished.

**262. Constitution of the Year Three.** The Convention now at last turned its attention to the great work for which it had originally been summoned, and drew up a constitution for the republic. This provided that the law-making power should be



FIG. 34. THE CLOSING OF THE JACOBIN CLUB

The hall of the Jacobins had been the scene of debates almost as important as those in the Convention, during the attempt to found a democratic republic. When it was closed and the Commune of Paris abolished, the wealthier classes resumed their rule

vested in a legislative assembly consisting of two houses. The lower house was called the Council of the Five Hundred, and the upper chamber the Council of the Elders. Members of the latter were required to be at least forty years of age. The executive powers were put in the hands of a *Directory* of five persons, to be chosen by the two chambers.

**263. Achievements of the Convention.** In October, 1795, the Convention finally dissolved itself, having governed the country during three years of unprecedented excitement, danger, and disorder. While it was responsible for the horrors of the Reign of

Terror, its committees had carried France through the terrible crisis of 1793. The civil war had been brought to a speedy end, and the coalition of foreign powers had been defeated. Meanwhile other committees appointed by the Convention had been quietly working upon the problem of bettering the system of education, which had been taken by the State out of the hands of the clergy. Progress had also been made toward establishing a single system of law for the whole country to replace the old confusion. The new republican calendar was not destined to survive many years, but the metric system of weights and measures introduced by the Convention has now been adopted by most European countries, and is used by men of science in England and America.

On the other hand, the Reign of Terror, the depreciated paper currency,<sup>1</sup> and many hasty and unwise laws passed by the Convention had produced all sorts of disorder and uncertainty. The Directory did little to better conditions, and it was not until Napoleon's strong hand grasped the helm of government in the year 1800 that order was really restored.

### QUESTIONS

I. What were Calonne's plans, and why did they fail? How did the Estates General come to be summoned in 1789? What were the chief questions raised in regard to their organization? What were the *cahiers*, and upon what main points did they agree? By what process did the Estates General turn into a national assembly?

II. What were the causes and results of the attack on the Bastille? What does the word *Commune* mean? What were the chief provisions of the decree abolishing the feudal system? Give an account of the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Why were these decrees drawn up?

III. Under what conditions was the National Assembly moved to Paris? What were the reforms made in the organization of the French Church? What immediate results did they have on the course of the Revolution?

<sup>1</sup> See above, § 224. There were about forty billions of francs in assignats in circulation at the opening of 1796. At that time it required nearly three hundred francs in paper money to procure one in specie.

IV. Who were the emigrant nobles, and what was their plan for restoring the old régime? What were the results of the king's attempted flight in June, 1791? What was the Declaration of Pillnitz? Who were the Jacobins? What various kinds of matter do we find in a modern newspaper? Tell the measures which were taken against the emigrant nobles and the nonjuring clergy. Why did the Legislative Assembly declare war on Austria? Why did Prussia enter the war?

V. How was the First French Republic established? Do you see any good reasons for the execution of Louis XVI? Why did France declare war on England? With what European powers was France at war by the spring of 1793?

VI. What was the need of a Committee of Public Safety? Who were the Girondists? the Mountain? What led to civil war in France, and what was the outcome of it? What do you understand by the Reign of Terror? Can you give any justification of the harsh measures taken by the Convention and its committees?

VII. What were Robespierre's views? What were the reasons for his fall? Describe the constitution of the Year Three. Review the chief acts of the Convention.

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) the Estates General—the National Assembly, pp. 248–255; (2) the abolition of the feudal system, pp. 256–259; (3) the Declaration of the Rights of Man, pp. 260–262; (4) the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, pp. 273–277; (5) the abolition of the monarchy and foreign intervention, pp. 278–294; (6) the Reign of Terror, pp. 295–308.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Mirabeau, Danton, Marat, Robespierre, Jacobin, Girondist, and Madame de Staël.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the overthrow of absolutism in France, pp. 468–479; (2) the reforms of the National Assembly, pp. 479–486; (3) the limited monarchy and the foreign war, pp. 486–500; (4) the first French Republic, pp. 500–512; (5) the Directory, pp. 512–517.



## CHAPTER IX

### EUROPE AND NAPOLEON

#### I. GENERAL BONAPARTE

**264. The Napoleonic Period.** The aristocratic military leaders of Old France had either run away or been discredited along with the noble class to which they belonged. Among the commanders who, through exceptional ability, arose in their stead, one was soon to dominate the history of Europe as no man before him had ever done. For fifteen years his biography and the political history of Europe are so nearly synonymous that the period that we are now entering upon may properly be called, after him, the Napoleonic Period.

**265. Napoleon Bonaparte (b. 1769).** Napoleon Bonaparte was hardly a Frenchman in origin. It is true that the island of Corsica, where he was born August 15, 1769, had at that time belonged to France for a year. But Napoleon's native language was Italian, he was descended from Italian ancestors who had come to the island in the sixteenth century, and his career revives, on a magnificent scale, the ambitions and the policy of an Italian despot of the fifteenth century (Vol. I, § 666).

When he was ten years old he was taken to France by his father. After learning a little of the French language, which he is said never to have mastered perfectly, he was put into a military school, where he remained for six years. He soon came to hate the young French aristocrats with whom he was associated. He wrote to his father, "I am tired of exposing my poverty and seeing these shameless boys laughing over it, who are superior to me only in their wealth, but infinitely beneath me in noble sentiments." Gradually the ambition to free his little island country from French control developed in him. He, however, met no success in his intrigues in Corsica.

**266. Napoleon Commander of the Army of Italy (1796).** The following three years were for Bonaparte a period of great uncertainty. He had lost his love for Corsica and as yet he had no foothold in France. He managed, however, to show his military skill and decision on two occasions and gained thereby the friendship of the Directory. In the spring of 1796 he was made by the Directory commander in chief of the army of Italy. This important appointment at the age of twenty-seven forms the opening of a military career which in extent and grandeur hardly finds a parallel in history, except that of Alexander the Great (Vol. I, §§ 258 ff.). And of all Bonaparte's campaigns, none is more interesting perhaps than his first, that in Italy in 1796-1797.



FIG. 35. NAPOLEON'S BIRTHPLACE

**267. Prussia and Spain retire from the War.** After the armies raised by the Committee of Public Safety had driven back their enemies in the autumn of 1793, the French occupied the Austrian Netherlands, Holland, and that portion of Germany which lies on the left, or west, bank of the Rhine. Austria and Prussia were again busy with a new, and this time final, partition of Poland (§ 60). As Prussia had little real interest in the war with France, she soon concluded peace with the new republic, April, 1795. Spain followed her example and left Austria, England, and the kingdom of Sardinia to carry on the war.

**268. The Campaign in Italy (1796-1797).** General Bonaparte had to face the combined armies of Austria and of the king of Sardinia. By marching north from Savona he skillfully separated

his two enemies, forced the Sardinian troops back toward their capital, Turin, and compelled the king of Sardinia to conclude a truce with France.<sup>1</sup>

This left him free to advance against the Austrians. These he outflanked and forced to retreat. On May 15, 1796, he entered Milan. The Austrian commander then shut himself up in the strong fortress of Mantua. Bonaparte promptly besieged the city, which was forced to capitulate early in the following year. As soon as Bonaparte had removed all danger of an attack in the rear, the young French general led his army to within a hundred miles of Vienna, and by April, 1797, the Austrian court was glad to sign a preliminary peace.

**269. The Treaty of Campo-Formio (1797).** The provisions of the treaty of peace, which was concluded at Campo-Formio, October 17, 1797, illustrate the unscrupulous manner in which Austria and the French Republic disposed of the helpless lesser states. It began the bewilderingly rapid changes in the map of Europe, which were so characteristic of the Napoleonic Period. Austria ceded to France the Austrian Netherlands and secretly agreed to use its good offices to secure for France a great part of the left bank of the Rhine. Austria also recognized the "Cisalpine" republic which Bonaparte had created out of the smaller states of northern Italy, and which was under the "protection" of France. This new state included Milan, Modena, some of the papal dominions, and, lastly, a part of the possessions of the renowned but defenseless republic of Venice (Vol. I, §§ 662-664), which Napoleon had iniquitously destroyed. Austria received as a partial indemnity the rest of the possessions of the Venetian republic, including Venice itself.

**270. General Bonaparte's Boundless Ambition.** While the negotiations were going on at Campo-Formio the young general had established a brilliant court in a villa near Milan. "His salons," an observer informs us, "were filled with a throng of

<sup>1</sup> The island of Sardinia had in 1720 been given to the duke of Savoy, who was also ruler of Piedmont. The duke thereupon assumed the title King of Sardinia, but Piedmont, with its capital Turin, remained the most important part of the kingdom of Sardinia. The king of Sardinia later became the king of Italy (Chapter XV below).

generals, officials, and purveyors, as well as the highest nobility and the most distinguished men of Italy, who came to solicit the favor of a glance or a moment's conversation." He appears already



CENTRAL EUROPE, TO ILLUSTRATE NAPOLEON'S CAMPAIGN, 1796-1801

to have conceived the rôle that he was to play later. We have a report of a most extraordinary conversation which occurred at this time.

"What I have done so far," he declared, "is nothing. I am but at the opening of the career that I am to run. Do you suppose that I have gained my victories in Italy in order to advance the lawyers of the Directory? . . . Do you think either that my object is to establish a republic? What a notion! . . . What the French want is glory and the satisfaction of their vanity; . . .



Let the Directory attempt to deprive me of my command and they will see who is the master. The nation must have a head, a head who is rendered illustrious by glory and not by theories of government, fine phrases, or the talk of idealists." There is no doubt whom General Bonaparte had in mind when he spoke of the needed head of the French nation who should be "rendered illustrious by glory." This son of a poor Corsican noble, but yesterday a mere unlucky adventurer, had arranged his program; two years and a half later, at the age of thirty, he was the master of the French Republic.

**271. Personal Characteristics.** Bonaparte was a short man, at this time extremely thin, but his striking features, quick, searching eye, abrupt, animated gestures, and rapid speech, incorrect as it was, made a deep impression upon those who came in contact with him. He possessed in a supreme degree two qualities that very rarely go together. He was a dreamer, and at the same time a man whose practical skill and mastery of detail amounted to genius. He once told a friend that he was wont, when a poor lieutenant, to allow his imagination full play and fancy things just as he would have them. Then he would coolly consider the exact steps to be taken if he were to try to make his dream come true. At the age of twenty-eight he had become the chief general of France; at thirty he was to become master of the country.

**272. Sources of Power in Napoleon's Character.** In order to explain Bonaparte's success it must be remembered that he was not hampered or held back by the fear of doing wrong. He was utterly unscrupulous, whether dealing with an individual or a nation, and appears to have been absolutely without any sense of moral right and wrong. Affection for his friends and relatives never stood in the way of his selfish ambitions. To these traits must be added unrivaled military genius and the power of intense and almost uninterrupted work.

**273. Conditions which made possible Napoleon's Career.** But even Bonaparte, unexampled as were his abilities, could never have extended his power over all of western Europe had it not been for the weakness and incompetence of most of the states with

which he had to deal. There was no strong German empire in his day, no mighty Prussian army ; Austria was already humbled, and its defeat had opened Italy to the French. In short, the French Republic was surrounded by small states almost defenseless against an unscrupulous invader.

## II. HOW BONAPARTE MADE HIMSELF MASTER OF FRANCE

**274. Bonaparte conceives an Expedition to Egypt.** After arranging the Peace of Campo-Formio, General Bonaparte returned to Paris. He at once perceived that France, in spite of her enthusiasm for him, was not yet ready to accept him as her ruler. He saw, too, that he would soon sacrifice his prestige if he lived quietly in Paris like an ordinary person. His active mind soon conceived a plan which would forward his interests. France was still at war with England, its most persevering enemy during this period. Bonaparte convinced the Directory that England could best be ruined in the long run by seizing Egypt and threatening her commerce through the Mediterranean and perhaps ultimately her dominion in India. Bonaparte, fascinated by the career of Alexander the Great, pictured himself riding to India on the back of an elephant and dispossessing England of her most precious colonial dependencies. He had, however, still another, and a characteristic, reason for undertaking the expedition. France was on the eve of a new war with the European powers. Bonaparte foresaw that, if he could withdraw with him some of France's best officers, the Directory might soon find itself so embarrassed that he could return as a national savior. And even so it fell out.

**275. The Campaign in Egypt (1798-1799).** The French fleet left Toulon May 19, 1798. It was so fortunate as to escape the English squadron under Nelson, which sailed by it in the night. Bonaparte arrived at Alexandria July 1 and easily defeated the Turkish troops in the famous battle of the Pyramids, near Cairo. Meanwhile Nelson, who did not know the destination of the enemy's fleet, had returned from the Syrian coast, where he had looked for the French in vain. He discovered Bonaparte's ships

in the harbor of Alexandria and annihilated them in the first battle of the Nile (August 1, 1798). The French troops were now completely cut off from Europe.

**276. Syrian Campaign.** The Porte (that is, the Turkish government) declared war against France, and Bonaparte resolved to attack Turkey by land. He accordingly marched into Syria

in the spring of 1799, but was repulsed at Acre, where the Turkish forces were aided by the English fleet. Pursued by pestilence, the army regained Cairo in June, after terrible suffering and loss. It was still strong enough to annihilate a Turkish army that landed at Alexandria.



EGYPTIAN CAMPAIGN

**277. The Return of Bonaparte to France.** News, however, now reached Bonaparte from

Europe which convinced him that the time had come for him to hasten back. Northern Italy, which he had won, was lost; the allies were in arms again and were about to invade France, and the Directory was completely demoralized. Bonaparte accordingly secretly deserted his army and managed, by a series of happy accidents, to reach France with a few of his best officers by October 9, 1799.

**278. The Coup d'État of the 18th Brumaire (November 9, 1799).** The Directory, one of the most corrupt and inefficient governmental bodies that the world has ever seen, had completely disgraced itself. Bonaparte readily found others to join with him in a conspiracy to overthrow it. A plan was formed for destroying the old government and replacing it by a new one. This is a



procedure so familiar in France during the past century that it is known even in English as a *coup d'état* (literally translated, a "stroke of state"). The conspirators had a good many friends



FIG. 36. BONAPARTE'S *COUP D'ÉTAT* OF THE 18TH BRUMAIRE

Bonaparte's invasion of the hall of the Assembly with his soldiers, to "restore liberty," was a military conspiracy against the existing government. The legislators accused him of treason, and he almost lost his nerve at the critical moment. His brother, however, harangued the soldiers outside, telling them their general's life was in danger, and they drove everyone from the hall. Thus Bonaparte got control of France

in the two assemblies (§ 262). Nevertheless, Bonaparte had to order his soldiers to invade the hall in which the Assembly of the Five Hundred was in session and scatter his opponents before he



could accomplish his purpose. A chosen few were then reassembled under the presidency of Lucien Bonaparte, one of Napoleon's brothers, who was a member of the Assembly. They voted to put the government in the hands of General Bonaparte and two others, to be called *Consuls*. These were to proceed, with the aid of a commission, to draw up a new constitution.

**279. Bonaparte First Consul.** The new constitution was a very cumbrous and elaborate one. It provided for no less than four assemblies, one to propose the laws, one to consider them, one to vote upon them, and one to decide on their constitutionality. But Bonaparte saw to it that as First Consul he himself had practically all the power in his own hands.

In each *department* he put an officer called a *prefect*, in each subdivision of the department a *subprefect*. These, together with the mayors and police commissioners of the towns, were all appointed by the First Consul. The prefects, "little First Consuls," as Bonaparte called them, resembled the former *intendants*—the king's officers under the old régime. The new government suggested in several important respects that of Louis XIV.

**280. The Plebiscite.** The new ruler objected as decidedly as Louis XIV would have done to the idea of being controlled by the people, who, he believed, knew nothing of public affairs. It was enough, he thought, if they were allowed to say whether they wished a certain form of government or not. He therefore introduced what he called a *plebiscite*. The new constitution when completed was submitted to the nation at large, and all were allowed to vote "yes" or "no" on the question of its adoption. Over three million voted in favor of it and only fifteen hundred and sixty-two against it. This did not necessarily mean, however, that practically the whole nation wished to have General Bonaparte as its ruler. A great many may have preferred what seemed to them an objectionable form of government to the risk of rejecting it. Herein lies the injustice of the plebiscite. There are many questions that cannot be answered by a simple "yes" or "no."

**281. Bonaparte generally Acceptable to France.** Yet the accession of the popular young general to power was undoubtedly

grateful to the majority of citizens, who longed above all for a stable government. The Swedish envoy wrote just after the *coup d'état*: "A legitimate monarch has perhaps never found a people more ready to do his bidding than Bonaparte, and it would be inexcusable if this talented general did not take advantage of this to introduce a better form of government upon a firmer basis. It is literally true that France will perform impossibilities in order to aid him in this. The people (with the exception of a despicable horde of anarchists) are so sick and weary of revolutionary horrors and folly that they believe that any change cannot fail to be for the better. . . . Even the royalists, whatever their views may be, are sincerely devoted to Bonaparte, for they attribute to him the intention of gradually restoring the old order of things. The indifferent element cling to him as the one most likely to give France peace. The enlightened republicans, although they tremble for their form of government, prefer to see a single man of talent possess himself of the power rather than a club of intriguers."

**282. Necessity of renewing the War.** Upon becoming First Consul, General Bonaparte found France at war with England, Russia, Austria, Turkey, and Naples. These powers had formed a coalition in December, 1798, had defeated the armies that the Directory sent against them, and undone Bonaparte's work in Italy. It now devolved upon him to reëstablish the prestige of France abroad, as well as to restore order and prosperity at home. Besides, he knew that he must keep himself before the people as a military hero if he wished to maintain his supremacy.

### III. HOW BONAPARTE SECURED PEACE IN 1801 AND REORGANIZED GERMANY

**283. Napoleon crosses the Alps.** Early in the year 1800 Bonaparte began secretly to collect an army near Dijon. This he proposed to direct against an Austrian army which was besieging the French in Genoa. Instead of marching straight into Italy, as would have been most natural, the First Consul resolved to

take the Austrian forces in the rear. Emulating Hannibal (Vol. I, § 330), he led his troops over the famous Alpine pass of the Great St. Bernard, dragging his cannon over in the trunks of trees which had been hollowed out for the purpose. He arrived safely in Milan on the second of June to the utter astonishment of the Austrians, who were taken completely by surprise.

**284. Battle of Marengo, June 14, 1800.** Bonaparte now moved westward and defeated the Austrians in the famous battle of Marengo (June 14), and added one more to the list of his great military successes. A truce was signed next day, and the Austrians retreated eastward, leaving Bonaparte to restore French influence in Lombardy. The districts that he had "freed" had to support his army, and the reëstablished Cisalpine republic was forced to pay a monthly tax of two million francs.

**285. General Peace of 1802.** A second victory gained by the French in December of the same year brought Austria to terms, and she agreed to conclude a separate peace with the French Republic. This was the beginning of a general pacification. During the years 1801-1802 treaties were signed with *all* the powers with which France had been at war, even with England, who had not laid down her arms since war was first declared in 1793.

**286. How Louisiana became a Part of the United States.** Among the fleeting results of the treaties concluded by the French Republic in 1801 were two provisions that were to have momentous results for the United States and the world at large. It will be remembered that France after her defeat in the Seven Years' War had turned over her great province of Louisiana to Spain (§ 75). Spain now returned Louisiana to France in exchange for certain supposed advantages which Bonaparte conceded to her in Italy. When war broke out again, as it soon did, the First Consul found it advantageous to sell this vast region to the United States, of which it now forms an important part. Of the many transfers of territory made during his reign none was more wide reaching in its results than this.

**287. Transformation of Germany.** The second provision of great importance led years later to the formation of the powerful

German Empire, against which a great part of the civilized world found itself fighting in the war which opened in 1914.

**288. Cession of the Left Bank of the Rhine to France.** In the treaty signed by Austria at Lunéville in February, 1801, the emperor ceded to the French Republic the territories lying on the left bank of the Rhine which belonged to the Holy Roman Empire, and agreed that thereafter the Rhine should form the boundary of France from the point where it left Switzerland to where it flowed into Dutch territory. As a natural consequence of this cession various princes and states of the Empire found themselves dispossessed, either wholly or in part, of their lands. The Empire pledged itself to furnish certain German rulers who had lost possessions on the left bank of the Rhine with "an indemnity within the Empire."

**289. Secularization of Church Lands.** This provision implied a veritable transformation of the old Holy Roman Empire, which, except for the development of Prussia, was still in pretty much the same confused condition as in Charles V's time (Vol. I, § 728). It consisted of two or three hundred practically independent states and free towns. There was no unoccupied land to give the dispossessed princes; but there were two classes of states in the Empire that did not belong to *hereditary* princes—namely, the ecclesiastical states and the free towns. As the churchmen,—archbishops, bishops, and abbots,—who ruled over the ecclesiastical states, were forbidden by the rules of the Church to marry, they could of course have no lawful heirs. Should an ecclesiastical ruler be deprived of his realms, he might, therefore, be indemnified by a pension for life, with no fear of any injustice to heirs, since there could be none. The transfer of the lands of an ecclesiastical prince to a lay ruler—that is, hereditary prince—was called *secularization*.

**290. Decree of the German Diet Redistributing German Territory (1803).** *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss* was the high-sounding German name of the great decree issued by the imperial diet in 1803, redistributing the territory so as to indemnify the hereditary princes dispossessed by the cession of the left bank of



the Rhine to France. All the ecclesiastical states except the electorate of Mainz were turned over to lay rulers. Of the forty-eight imperial cities, only six were left. Three of these still exist as members of the present German republic; namely, the Hanseatic towns—Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. Bavaria received the bishoprics of Würzburg, Bamberg, Augsburg, Freising, and a number of the imperial cities. Baden received the bishoprics of Constance, Basel, Speyer, etc. The old knights were deprived of their political rights within the next two or three years by the several states within whose boundaries they lay.

**291. The Consolidation of Germany begun.** The final distribution was preceded by a bitter and undignified scramble among the princes for additional bits of territory. All turned to Paris for favors, since the First Consul, and not the German diet, was really the arbiter in the matter. Germany never sank to a lower degree of national degradation than at this period. But this amalgamation was, nevertheless, the beginning of her political regeneration; for without the consolidation of the hundreds of practically independent little states into a few well-organized monarchies, such a union as the later German Empire would have been impossible, and the country must have remained indefinitely in its traditional impotency. *Thus Germany owed to a French ruler, not to any of its emperors or to Prussia, the first measures which resulted in the German Empire established in 1871!*

**292. Extension of French Territory.** The treaties of 1801 left France in possession of the Austrian Netherlands and the left bank of the Rhine, to which Piedmont was soon added. Bonaparte found a further resource in the *dependencies*, which it was his policy to create. Holland became the Batavian Republic and, with the Italian (originally the Cisalpine) Republic, came under French control and contributed money and troops for the forwarding of French interests. The constitution of Switzerland was reformed in the interests of the First Consul and, incidentally, to the great advantage of the country itself.

#### IV. BONAPARTE RESTORES ORDER AND PROSPERITY IN FRANCE

**293. Bonaparte's Reforms.** The activity of the extraordinary man who had placed himself at the head of the French republic was by no means confined to the important alterations of the map of Europe described above. He was indefatigable in carrying out a series of internal reforms, second only in importance to those of the great Revolution of 1789. The Reign of Terror and the incompetence of the Directory's government had left France in a very bad plight.<sup>1</sup> Bonaparte's reorganization of the government has already been noticed. The finances were in a terrible condition. These the First Consul adjusted with great skill, quickly restored the national credit, and established the Bank of France.

**294. Bonaparte and the Church.** He then set about meeting the great problem of the nonjuring clergy, who were still under suspicion for refusing to sanction the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (§§ 225-226). Under the rule of the Directory persecution had ceased and priests were again officiating in thousands of parishes. All imprisoned priests were now freed, on promising not to oppose the constitution. Their churches were restored to them, and the distinction between "nonjuring" and "constitutional" clergymen was obliterated. Sunday, which had been abolished by the republican calendar (§ 243 and n.), was once more observed, and all the revolutionary holidays, except July 14—the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille—and the first day of the republican year, were done away with.

**295. The Concordat of 1801.** A formal treaty with the Pope, the Concordat of 1801, was concluded, which revoked some of the provisions of the Civil Constitution, especially the election of the priests and bishops by the people, and recognized the Pope as the head of the Church. It is noteworthy, however, that Bonaparte did not restore to the Church its ancient

<sup>1</sup> The roads were dilapidated and the harbors filled with sand; taxes were unpaid, robbery prevailed, and there was a general decay in industry. A manufacturer in Paris who had employed from sixty to eighty workmen now had but ten. The lace, paper, and linen industries were as good as destroyed.

possessions and that he reserved to himself the right to appoint the bishops, as the former kings had done.

**296. The Emigrant Nobles return.** As for the emigrant nobles, Bonaparte decreed that no more names should be added to the lists. The striking of names from the list and the return of confiscated lands that had not already been sold, he made favors to be granted by himself. Parents and relatives of emigrants were no longer to be regarded as incapable of holding public offices. In April, 1802, a general amnesty was issued, and no less than forty thousand families returned to France.

**297. Old Habits resumed.** There was a gradual reaction from the fantastic innovations of the Reign of Terror. The old titles of address, "Monsieur" and "Madame," were again used instead of the revolutionary "Citizen." Streets which had been rebaptized with republican names resumed their former ones. Old titles of nobility were revived, and something very like a royal court began to develop at the Palace of the Tuileries; for, except in name, Bonaparte was already a king, and his wife, Josephine, a queen.

It had been clear for some years that the nation was weary of political agitation. How great a blessing after the anarchy of the past to put all responsibility upon one who showed himself capable of concluding a long war with unprecedented glory for France and of reëstablishing order and the security of person and property, the necessary conditions for renewed prosperity! How natural that the French should welcome a despotism to which they had been accustomed for centuries, after suffering as they had under nominally republican institutions!

**298. The Code Napoléon.** One of the greatest and most permanent of Bonaparte's achievements still remains to be noted. The confused laws of the old régime had been much modified by the successive assemblies. All this needed a final revision, and Bonaparte appointed a commission to undertake this great task. Their draft of the new code was discussed in the Council of State, and the First Consul had many suggestions to make. The resulting codification of the civil law—the *Code Napoléon*—was introduced not only in France but also, with some modifications, in

Rhenish Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, Holland, Belgium, Italy, and even in the state of Louisiana. The criminal and the commercial law were also codified. These codes carried with them into foreign lands the principles of equality upon which they were based and thus diffused the benefits of the Revolution beyond the borders of France.

**299. Napoleon made Consul for Life (1802); and Emperor (1804).** Bonaparte was able gradually to modify the French Constitution so that his power became more and more absolute. In 1802 he was appointed consul for life and given the right to name his successor. Even this did not satisfy his insatiable ambition, which demanded that his actual power should be clothed with all the splendor of kingship. In May, 1804, he was accordingly given the title of "Emperor," and (in December) crowned, as the successor of Charlemagne, with great pomp in the cathedral of Notre Dame. He at once proceeded to establish a new nobility to take the place of that abolished by the first National Assembly in 1790.

**300. Napoleon's Censorship of the Press.** From this time on he became increasingly tyrannical and hostile to criticism. At the very beginning of his administration he had suppressed a great part of the numerous political newspapers and forbidden the establishment of new ones. As emperor he showed himself still more exacting. His police furnished the news to the papers and carefully omitted all that might offend their suspicious master. He ordered the journals to "put in quarantine all news that might be disadvantageous or disagreeable to France." His ideal was to suppress all newspapers but one, which should be used for official purposes.

## V. HOW NAPOLEON DESTROYED THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

**301. Necessity of Continued War for Napoleon.** A great majority of the French undoubtedly longed for peace, but Napoleon's position made war a personal necessity for him. No one saw this more clearly than he. "If," he said to his Council of



State in the summer of 1802, "the European states intend ever to renew the war, the sooner it comes the better. Every day the remembrance of their defeat grows dimmer and at the same time the prestige of our victories pales. . . . France needs glorious deeds, and hence war. She must be the first among the states, or



FIG. 37. NAPOLEON I

she is lost. I shall put up with peace as long as our neighbors can maintain it, but I shall regard it as an advantage if they force me to take up my arms again before they are rusted. . . . In our position I shall look on each conclusion of peace as simply a short armistice, and I regard myself as destined during my term of office to fight almost without intermission."

On another occasion, in 1804, Napoleon said,

"There will be no rest in Europe until it is under a single chief—an emperor who shall have kings for officers, who shall distribute kingdoms to his lieutenants, and shall make this one king of Italy, that one of Bavaria; this one ruler of Switzerland, that one governor of Holland, each having an office of honor in the imperial household." This was the ideal that he now found himself in a situation to carry out with marvelous exactness.

**302. England's Persistent Opposition to Napoleon.** There were many reasons why the peace with England (concluded at Amiens in March, 1802) should be speedily broken, especially as the First Consul was not averse to a renewal of the war. The obvious intention of Napoleon to bring as much of Europe under his control as he could, and the imposition of high duties on

English goods in those territories that he already controlled, filled the business people of England with apprehension. The English people longed for peace, but peace appeared only to offer an opportunity to the Corsican usurper to ruin England by a continuous war upon her commerce. This was the secret of England's persistence. All the other European powers concluded peace with Napoleon at some time during his reign. England alone did not lay down her arms a second time until the emperor of the French was a prisoner.

**303. War between France and England renewed in 1803.** War was renewed between England and France in 1803. Bonaparte promptly occupied Hanover, of which it will be remembered that the English king was elector (§ 161), and declared the coast blockaded from Hanover to Otranto. Holland, Spain, Portugal, and the Ligurian republic—formerly the republic of Genoa—were, by hook or by crook, induced to agree to furnish each its share of men or money to the French army and to exclude English ships from their ports.

**304. Napoleon threatens to invade England.** To cap the climax, England was alarmed by the appearance of a French army at Boulogne, just across the Channel. A great number of flat-boats were collected and troops trained to embark and disembark. Apparently Napoleon harbored the firm purpose of invading the British Isles. Yet the transportation of a large body of troops across the English Channel, trifling as is the distance, would have been very hazardous, and by many it was deemed downright impossible. No one knows whether Napoleon really expected to make the trial. It is quite possible that his main purpose in collecting an army at Boulogne was to have it in readiness for the continental war which he saw immediately ahead of him. He succeeded, at any rate, in terrifying England, who prepared to defend herself.

**305. Coalition of Russia, Austria, England, and Sweden.** The Tsar, Alexander I, had submitted a plan for the reconciliation of France and England in August, 1803. The rejection of this and the evident intention of Napoleon to include the eastern coast

of the Adriatic in his sphere of influence led Russia to join a new coalition which, by July, 1805, included Austria, Sweden, and, of course, England. Austria was especially affected by the increase of Napoleon's power in Italy. He had been crowned king of Italy in May, 1805, had created a little duchy in northern Italy for his sister, and had annexed the Ligurian republic to France. There were rumors, too, that he was planning to seize the Venetian territories which had been given to Austria.

**306. The War of 1805.** War was declared against Austria, August 23, and four days later the army at Boulogne was ordered eastward. One of the Austrian commanders exhibited the most startling incapacity in allowing himself to be shut up in Ulm, where he was forced to capitulate with all his troops (October 20). Napoleon then marched down the Danube with little opposition, and before the middle of November Vienna was in the possession of French troops. Napoleon thereupon led his forces north to meet the allied armies of Austria and Russia; these he defeated on December 2, in the terrible winter battle of Austerlitz. Russia then withdrew for a time, signed an armistice, and left Austria to submit to a humiliating peace, the Treaty of Pressburg.

**307. The Treaty of Pressburg.** By this treaty Austria recognized all Napoleon's changes in Italy and ceded various of her possessions to rulers friendly to him. She further agreed to ratify the assumption, on the part of the rulers of Bavaria and Würtemberg, of the titles of "King." Napoleon was now in a position still further to reorganize western Europe with a view to establishing a great international federation of which he should be the head.

**308. The Dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire (1806).** Napoleon had no desire to unify Germany; he merely wished to maintain a certain number of independent states, or groups of states, which he could conveniently control. He had provided, in the Treaty of Pressburg, that the newly created sovereigns should enjoy the "plenitude of sovereignty" and all the rights derived therefrom, precisely as did the rulers of Austria and Prussia.

This treaty, by explicitly declaring several of the most important of the German states altogether independent of the emperor,

rendered the further existence of the Holy Roman Empire impossible. The emperor, Francis II, accordingly abdicated, August 6, 1806. Thus the most imposing and enduring political office known to history was formally abolished (Vol. I, § 585).

**309. The Title "Emperor of Austria."** Francis II did not, however, lose his title of "Emperor." Shortly after the First Consul had received that title, Francis adopted the formula "Emperor of Austria," to designate him as the ruler of all the possessions of his house.<sup>1</sup> Hitherto he had been officially known as King of Hungary, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Galicia, and Laodomeria, Duke of Lorraine, Venice, Salzburg, etc., Grand Duke of Transylvania, Margrave of Moravia, etc.

## VI. NAPOLEON HUMILIATES PRUSSIA: THE CONTINENTAL BLOCKADE

**310. The Confederation of the Rhine.** Meanwhile Napoleon had organized a union of the southern German states, called the Confederation of the Rhine, and had assumed its headship as "Protector." This he had done, he assured Europe, "in the dearest interests of his people and of his neighbors," adding the pious hope that the French armies had crossed the Rhine for the last time and that the people of Germany would witness no longer, "except in the annals of the past, the horrible pictures of disorder, devastation, and slaughter that war invariably brings with it." In reality, however, Napoleon was enlarging his empire by erecting dependent states east of the Rhine.

Immediately after the battle of Austerlitz Napoleon proclaimed that the king of Naples, who had allied himself with the English, had ceased to reign, and French generals were ordered to occupy Naples. In March, 1806, he made his brother Joseph king of Naples and Sicily, his brother Louis king of Holland, and his brother-in-law, Murat, duke of Cleves and Berg. These states and those of his German allies constituted what he called "the real French Empire."

<sup>1</sup> Thus Francis II of the Holy Roman Empire became Francis I of Austria.



**311. Prussia forced into War with France.** One of the most important of the continental states, it will have been noticed, had taken no part as yet in the opposition to the extension of Napoleon's power. Prussia, the first power to conclude peace with the new French Republic in 1795 (§ 267), had since that time maintained a strict neutrality. Had it yielded to Tsar Alexander's

persuasions and joined the coalition in 1805, it might have turned the tide at Austerlitz, or at any rate have encouraged further resistance to the conqueror. The hesitation of Frederick William III cost him dear, for Napoleon now forced him into war at a time when he could look for no assistance from Russia or the other powers.

Napoleon, as usual, did not fail either to see or to use his advantage. His conduct toward Prussia was most insolent. After setting her at enmity with England by



FIG. 38. FRANCIS I OF AUSTRIA

promising that she should have Hanover, he unblushingly offered to restore the electorate to George III. His insults now began to arouse the national spirit in Prussia, and the reluctant Frederick William was forced by the party in favor of war to break with Napoleon.

**312. Campaign of Jena (1806).** Prussia's army was, however, as has been well said, "only that of Frederick the Great grown twenty years older." One of Frederick's generals, the aged duke of Brunswick, who had issued the famous manifesto in 1792 (§ 241), was its leader. A single defeat, near Jena (October 14, 1806), put Prussia completely in the hands of her enemy. This one disaster produced complete demoralization throughout the country. Fortresses were

surrendered without resistance, and the king fled to the uttermost parts of his realm on the Russian boundary.

**313. Treaties of Tilsit (1807).** Napoleon now led his army into Poland, where he spent the winter in operations against Russia and her feeble Prussian ally. He closed an arduous campaign by a signal victory at Friedland (June 14, 1807), which was followed by the treaties of Tilsit with Russia and Prussia (July 7 and 9). Napoleon had no mercy on Prussia. Frederick William III lost all his possessions to the west of the Elbe and all that Prussia had gained in the second and third partitions of Poland. The Polish territory Napoleon made into a new subject kingdom called the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, and chose his friend the king of Saxony as its ruler. Out of the western lands of Prussia, which he later united with Hanover, he created the Kingdom of Westphalia for his brother Jerome. Russia, on the other hand, was treated




FIG. 39. NELSON'S COLUMN, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON

The English regard Nelson as the man who safeguarded their liberty by the victories of the fleet. Nelson was killed at Trafalgar (see next page) and buried with great ceremony in the crypt of St. Paul's, under the very center of the dome. Some years later "Trafalgar Square" was laid out at the point where the street leading to the Parliament buildings joins a chief business street—the Strand—and a gigantic column to Nelson erected, surmounted by a statue of the admiral. In the distance, to the left of the monument, one can see the great tower of the Parliament buildings

with marked consideration. The Tsar finally consented to recognize all the sweeping territorial changes that Napoleon had made, and secretly agreed to enforce the blockade against England should that country refuse to make peace.

**314. The Continental Blockade.** Napoleon's most persevering enemy, England, still remained unconquered and inaccessible. Just as Napoleon was undertaking his successful campaign against Austria in 1805, Nelson had annihilated a second French fleet in the renowned naval engagement of Trafalgar, off the coast of Spain. It seemed more than ever necessary, therefore, to ruin the trade and business of England, since there was obviously no likelihood of subduing it by arms.

**315. The Berlin Decree and Napoleon's "Paper" Blockade.** In May, 1806, England had declared the coast from the Elbe to Brest to be blockaded. Napoleon replied to this with the Berlin decree (November 21, 1806), in which he proclaimed it a monstrous abuse of the right for England to declare great stretches of coast in a state of blockade which her whole fleet would be unable to enforce. He retaliated with a blockade of the British Isles, which forbade all commerce with them. Letters or packages directed to England or to an Englishman or written in the English language were not to be permitted to pass through the mails in the countries he controlled. Every English subject in countries occupied by French troops or in the territory of Napoleon's allies was to be regarded as a prisoner of war and his property as a lawful prize. All trade in English goods was forbidden. This was, of course, only a "paper" blockade, since France and her allies could do little more than capture, now and then, some unfortunate vessel which was supposed to be coming from, or bound for, an English port.

**316. England agrees to license Neutral Ships; the Milan Decree.** A year later England established a similar paper blockade of the ports of the French Empire and its allies, but hit upon the happy idea of permitting the ships of neutral powers to proceed, provided that they touched at an English port, secured a license from the English government, and paid a heavy export duty.

Napoleon was ready with a still more outrageous measure. In a decree issued from "our royal palace at Milan" (December, 1807), he ordered that all vessels, of whatever nationality, which submitted to the humiliating regulations of England, should be regarded as lawful prizes by the French privateers.

**317. The Plight of the United States.** The ships of the United States were at this time the most numerous and important of the neutral vessels carrying on the world's trade, and a very hard time they had between the Scylla of the English orders and the Charybdis of Napoleon's Berlin and Milan decrees. The *Baltimore Evening Post* in September, 1808, calculated that if an American ship bound for Holland with four hundred hogsheads of tobacco should decide to meet England's requirements and touch at London on the way, its owners would pay one and a half pence per pound on the tobacco and twelve shillings for each ton of the ship. With a hundred dollars for England's license to proceed on her way, and sundry other dues, the total would come to about thirteen thousand dollars. On the way home, if the neutral vessel wished to avoid the chance of capture by an English cruiser, she might pay, perhaps, sixteen thousand five hundred dollars more to England for the privilege of returning to Baltimore with a cargo of Holland gin. This would make the total contributions paid to Great Britain for a single voyage about thirty thousand dollars.

**318. The United States establishes an Embargo.** Alarmed and exasperated at the conduct of England and France, the Congress of the United States, at the suggestion of President Jefferson, passed an embargo act (December, 1807), which forbade all vessels to leave port. It was hoped that this would prevent the further loss of American ships and at the same time so interfere with the trade of England and France that they would make some concessions. But the only obvious result was the destruction of the previously flourishing commerce of the Atlantic coast towns, especially in New England. Early in 1809 Congress was induced to permit trade once more with the European nations, excepting France and England, but in 1812 the United States government finally drifted into war with England.




**319. Embarrassing Position of Neutral Nations.** It is of the utmost interest and importance to compare the situation of the United States during the Napoleonic wars with that in which she was placed when Germany and England resorted to blockades during the World War. In both cases the United States was drawn into the conflict in spite of her distance from the battlefields of Europe. America can never be indifferent to European struggles when they affect the freedom of the seas and endanger property and the lives of passengers and crews. And warring governments who possess fleets are very sure to disregard the rights of neutrals. It was this disregard on Germany's part that was the immediate cause of the United States's declaration of war against her in 1917.

**320. Napoleon's "Continental System."** Napoleon expressed the utmost confidence in his plan of ruining England by cutting her off from the Continent. He was cheered to observe that a pound sterling was no longer worth twenty-five francs, but only seventeen, and that the discouraged English merchants were beginning to urge Parliament to conclude peace. In order to cripple England permanently, he proposed to wean Europe from the use of those products which had hitherto come from English colonies and been brought by English ships. He encouraged the substitution of chicory for coffee, the cultivation of the sugar beet, and the discovery of new dyes to replace those coming from the tropics. But the distress caused by the disturbance in trade produced great discontent, especially in Russia; it rendered the domination of Napoleon more and more distasteful and finally contributed to his downfall.

## VII. NAPOLEON AT THE ZENITH OF HIS POWER (1808-1812)


**321. Napoleon's Policy in France.** France owed much to Napoleon, for he had restored order and retained many of the important reforms of the Revolution of 1789. His boundless ambition was, it is true, sapping her strength by forcing younger and younger men into his armies in order to build up the vast international federation of which he dreamed. But his





# EUROPE

AT THE  
TIME OF NAPOLEON'S  
GREATEST POWER  
ABOUT 1810



- Empire of France
- Dependencies







victories and the commanding position to which he had raised France could not but fill the nation with pride and satisfaction.

**322. Public Works.** He sought to gain popular approval by great public improvements. He built marvelous roads across the Alps and along the Rhine, which still fill the traveler with admiration. He beautified Paris by opening up wide streets and quays and building magnificent bridges and triumphal arches that kept fresh in the people's mind the recollection of his victories. By these means he gradually converted a medieval town into the most beautiful of modern capitals.

**323. Napoleon's Idea of Education.** The whole educational system was reorganized so that it could be as carefully watched and controlled by the emperor as any department of government. Napoleon argued that one of the chief aims of education should be the formation of loyal subjects who would be faithful both to him and to his successors. Under his direction, an *Imperial Catechism* was prepared for use in the schools, which not only taught loyalty to Napoleon but actually threatened with eternal perdition those who should fail in their obligations to him, including military service.




FIG. 40. ARCH OF TRIUMPH

Begun by Napoleon in 1806, this largest arch of triumph in the world was not completed until 1836. It is 160 feet high and stands on a slight hill, with streets radiating from all sides, so that it is known as the Arch of Triumph of the Star. It is therefore visible from all over the western part of the city. The monument recalls the days of the Roman Empire, upon which so many of the institutions and ideas of Republican and Napoleonic France were based

**324. The New Nobility and the Legion of Honor.** Napoleon created a new nobility, and he endeavored to assure the support of distinguished individuals by making them members of the Legion of Honor which he founded. The "Princes" whom he nominated received an annual income of two hundred thousand francs. The ministers of state, senators, members of his Council of State, and the archbishops received the title of "Count" and a revenue of thirty thousand francs, and so on. The army was not forgotten, for Napoleon felt that to be his chief support. The incomes of his marshals were enormous, and brave actions among the soldiers were rewarded with the decoration of the Legion of Honor.

**325. Napoleon's Despotism in France.** As time went on Napoleon's despotism grew more and more oppressive. No less than thirty-five hundred prisoners of state were arrested at his command, one because he hated Napoleon, another because in his letters he expressed opinions opposed to the government, and so on. No grievance was too petty to attract the attention of the emperor's jealous eye. He ordered the title of a *History of Bonaparte* to be changed to the *History of the Campaigns of Napoleon the Great*.<sup>1</sup> He forbade the performance of certain of Schiller's and Goethe's plays in German towns, as tending to arouse the discontent of the Germans with his rule.

**326. Growth of National Spirit.** Up to this time Napoleon had had only the opposition of the several European rulers to overcome in the extension of his power. The people of the various states which he had conquered showed an extraordinary indifference toward the changes in government. It was clear, however, that as soon as the *national spirit* was once awakened, the highly artificial

<sup>1</sup> Napoleon was never content with his achievements or his glory. On the day of his coronation, December, 1806, he complained to his minister Decrès that he had been born too late, that there was nothing great to be done any more. On his minister's remonstrating he added: "I admit that my career has been brilliant and that I have made a good record. But what a difference is there if we compare ours with ancient times. Take Alexander the Great, for example. After announcing himself the son of Jupiter, the whole East, except his mother, Aristotle, and a few Athenian pedants, believed this to be true. But now, should I nowadays declare myself the son of the Eternal Father, there isn't a fishwife who would not hiss me. No, the nations are too sophisticated, there is nothing great any longer possible."

system created by the French emperor would collapse. His first serious trouble came from the people and from an unexpected quarter.

**327. Revolt in Spain.** Napoleon decided, after Tilsit, that the Spanish peninsula must be brought more completely under his control. Portugal was too friendly to the English; and Spain, owing to serious quarrels in the royal family, seemed an easy prey. In the spring of 1808 Napoleon induced both the king and the crown prince of Spain to meet him at Bayonne. Here he was able to persuade or force both of them to surrender their rights to the throne; on June 6 he appointed his brother Joseph king of Spain, making Murat king of Naples in his stead.




FIG. 41. THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON

Joseph entered Madrid in July, armed with excellent intentions and a new constitution. The general rebellion in favor of the crown prince which immediately broke out had an element of religious enthusiasm in it, for the monks stirred up the people against Napoleon, on the ground that he was oppressing the Pope and depriving him of his dominions. One French army was captured, and another surrendered to the English forces which had landed in Portugal. Before the end of July, Joseph and the French troops had been compelled to retreat behind the Ebro River.

**328. Spain Subdued.** In November the French emperor himself led a magnificent army into Spain, two hundred thousand strong, in the best of condition and commanded by his ablest marshals. The Spanish troops, perhaps one hundred thousand in



number, were ill clad and inadequately equipped; what was worse, they were overconfident in view of their late victory. They were of course defeated, and Madrid surrendered December 4. Napoleon immediately abolished the Inquisition, the feudal dues, the internal-customs lines, and two thirds of the monasteries. This is an example of the way in which the reforms introduced by the French Revolution were spread throughout western Europe, many of them to prove lasting.

**329. The Peninsular War.** The next month Napoleon was back in Paris, as he saw that he had another war with Austria on his hands. He left Joseph on his insecure throne, after assuring the Spanish that God had given the French emperor the power and the will to overcome all obstacles.<sup>1</sup> He was soon to discover, however, that these very Spaniards could maintain a guerrilla warfare against which his best troops and most distinguished generals were powerless. The English army under the Duke of Wellington slowly but surely drove the French back over the Pyrenees. Napoleon's ultimate downfall was in no small measure due to this "Peninsular" War, as the English called the conflict in Spain.

**330. Austria again crushed by Napoleon.** In April, 1809, Austria ventured to declare war once more on the "enemy of Europe," but this time she found no one to aid her. The great battle of Wagram, near Vienna (July 5-6), was not perhaps so unmistakable a victory for the French as that of Austerlitz, but it forced Austria into just as humiliating a peace as that of Pressburg.

**331. The Treaty of Vienna (October, 1809).** Austria had announced that her object in going to war once more was the destruction of Napoleon's system of dependent states and had proposed "to restore to their rightful possessors all those lands belonging to them respectively before the Napoleonic usurpation."

<sup>1</sup> "It depends upon you alone," he said to the Spanish in his proclamation of December 7, "whether this moderate constitution that I offer you shall henceforth be your law. Should all my efforts prove vain, and should you refuse to justify my confidence, then nothing remains for me but to treat you as a conquered province and find a new throne for my brother. In that case I shall myself assume the crown of Spain and teach the ill-disposed to respect that crown, for God has given me power and will to overcome all obstacles."

The battle of Wagram put an end to these dreams, and the emperor of Austria was forced to surrender to the victor and his friends extensive territories, together with four million Austrian subjects.

**332. Napoleon marries Maria Louisa (1810).** The new Austrian minister, Metternich,—of whom we shall hear much later,—was anxious to establish a permanent alliance with the seemingly




FIG. 42. MUSIC ROOM IN THE PALACE OF COMPIÈGNE

Napoleon used the various palaces erected by the previous rulers of France. That at Compiègne, fifty miles from Paris, was built by Louis XV. The smaller harp was made, it is said, for Napoleon's heir, "the King of Rome," as his father called him. The boy was but three years old, however, when Napoleon abdicated in 1814, and was carried off to Austria by his Austrian mother, Maria Louisa. He was known by the Bonapartists as Napoleon II, but never ruled over France

invincible emperor of the French and did all he could to heal the breach between Austria and France by a royal marriage. Napoleon ardently desired an heir to whom he could transmit his vast dominions. As Josephine had borne him no children, he decided to divorce her, and, after considering and rejecting a Russian princess, he married (April, 1810) the Archduchess Maria Louisa, the daughter of the Austrian emperor and a grandniece of Marie Antoinette. In this way the former Corsican adventurer gained

admission to one of the oldest and proudest of reigning families, the Hapsburgs. His second wife bore him a son, who was styled "King of Rome."

**333. Napoleon at the Zenith of his Power.** Napoleon continued to long for still vaster realms. While he was in the midst of the war with Austria, he had issued a proclamation "reuniting" the Papal States to the French Empire. He argued that it was Charlemagne, emperor of the French, his august predecessor, who had originally given the lands to the popes and that now the tranquillity and welfare of his people required that the territory be reunited to France.

Holland, it will be remembered, had been formed into a kingdom under the rule of Napoleon's brother Louis, who tried sincerely to do his best for his subjects. The brothers had never agreed, and in 1810 Holland was annexed to France. Napoleon then extended the boundaries of France to the Baltic by seizing the German territory to the north, including the great ports of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck.

Napoleon had now reached the zenith of his power. All of western Europe, except England, was apparently under his control. France itself reached from the Baltic nearly to the Bay of Naples and included a considerable district beyond the Adriatic. The emperor of the French was also king of Italy and "protector" of the Confederation of the Rhine, which now included all of the German states except Austria and the remains of the kingdom of Prussia. Napoleon's brother Joseph was king of Spain, and his brother-in-law, Murat, king of Naples. Poland once more appeared on the map as the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, a faithful ally of its "restorer." The possessions of the emperor of Austria had so shrunk on the west that Hungary was now by far the most important part of Francis I's realms, but he had the satisfaction of beholding in his grandson, the king of Rome, the heir to unprecedented power. Surely in the history of the world there is nothing comparable to the career of Napoleon Bonaparte! He was, as a sage Frenchman has said, "as great as a man can be without virtue."



## VIII. THE FALL OF NAPOLEON

**334. Napoleon and Alexander I of Russia.** Among the continental states Russia alone was entirely out of Napoleon's control. There were plenty of causes for misunderstanding between the ardent young Tsar Alexander I and Napoleon. Up to this time the agreement of Tilsit had been maintained. Napoleon was, however, secretly opposing Alexander's plans for adding the Danubian provinces and Finland to his possessions. Then the possibility of Napoleon's reëstablishing Poland as a national kingdom which might threaten Russia's interests was a constant source of apprehension to Alexander. By 1812 Napoleon believed himself to be in a condition to subdue this doubtful friend, who might at any moment become a dangerous enemy. Against the advice of his more farsighted counselors, the emperor collected on the Russian frontier a vast army of four hundred thousand men, composed, to a great extent, of young conscripts and the troops furnished by his allies.

**335. Napoleon's Campaign in Russia (1812).** The story of the fearful Russian campaign which followed cannot be told here in detail. Napoleon had planned to take three years to conquer Russia, but he was forced on by the necessity of gaining at least one striking victory before he closed the season's campaign. The Russians simply retreated and led him far within a hostile and devastated country before they offered battle at Borodino (September 7). Napoleon won the battle, but his army was reduced to something over one hundred thousand men when he entered Moscow a week later. The town had been set on fire by the Russians before his arrival; he found his position unsafe and had to retreat as winter came on. The cold, the want of food, and the harassing attacks of the people along the route made that retreat one of the most signal military tragedies on record. Napoleon regained Poland early in December with scarcely twenty thousand of the four hundred thousand with which he had started less than six months before. This terrible disaster seemed to his enemies a divine retribution for his criminal ambition.



**336. Napoleon collects a New Army.** Napoleon hastened back to Paris, where he freely misrepresented the true state of affairs, even declaring that the army was in a good condition up to the time that he turned it over to Murat in December. While the loss of men in the Russian campaign was enormous, just those few had naturally survived who would be most essential in the formation of a new army; namely, the officers. With their help Napoleon soon had a force of no less than six hundred thousand men with which to return to the attack. This contained one hundred and fifty thousand conscripts who should not have been called into service until 1814, besides older men who had been hitherto exempted.

**337. Prussian Feudalism.** The first of Napoleon's allies to desert him was Prussia—and no wonder. She had felt his tyranny as no other country had. He had not only taken her lands; he had cajoled and insulted her; he had forced her to send her ablest minister, Stein,<sup>Prussia</sup> into exile because he had aroused the French emperor's dislike; he had opposed every measure of reform which might have served to strengthen the diminished kingdom which he had left to Frederick William III.

Prussia, notwithstanding the reforms of Frederick the Great, had retained its half-feudal institutions down to the defeat of Jena in 1806. The agricultural classes were serfs bound to the soil and compelled to work a certain part of each week for their lords without remuneration. The population was still divided into three distinct castes,—nobles, burghers, and peasants,—who could not acquire one another's land. The overwhelming defeat of the Prussian army at Jena forced the leaders of that old-fashioned country to consider whether its weakness was not partly due to its medieval institutions. Neither the king nor his usual advisers were ready for thoroughgoing reform, but there were some more progressive spirits, among whom Baron vom Stein and Prince Hardenberg were conspicuous, who induced the king to alter the old system.

**338. Serfdom abolished (1807).** The first step was taken in October, 1807, when a royal decree was issued which declared its

purpose to be nothing less than "to remove every obstacle that has hitherto prevented the individual from attaining such a degree of prosperity as he is capable of reaching." Serfdom was abolished and the old class system done away with, so that anyone, regardless of social rank, was legally free to purchase and hold landed property, no matter to whom it had formerly belonged. It was a slow matter putting the decree into effect, and some of the Prussian peasants were still in a condition of serfdom down to the middle of the nineteenth century.

**339. Origin of the Junker Party.** It is important to note that while serfs had practically disappeared in England and France hundreds of years earlier, it was not until the opening of the nineteenth century, and then under the stress of dire calamity, that Prussia



FIG. 43. STEIN

sufficiently modernized herself to abolish the medieval manor and free the peasants until then bound to the soil and sold with it. But the manorial lords, the so-called Junkers, remained rich and influential and continued, with their ancient notions of kingship by the grace of God and of military prowess, to exercise a fatal influence on the Prussian government. Moreover, the mass of the Prussian people seemed to retain something of their old servile attitude toward their masters.

**340. Origin of the Modern Prussian Army.** The old army of Frederick the Great had been completely discredited, and a few days after the signing of the Treaty of Tilsit a commission for military reorganization was appointed. The object of the

1800

reformers was to introduce universal military service. Napoleon permitted Prussia to maintain only a small force of not more than forty-two thousand men, but the reformers arranged that this army should be continually recruited by new men, while those who had had some training should retire and form a reserve. In this way, in spite of Napoleon's restrictions on the size of the regular Prussian army, there were before long as many as a hundred and fifty thousand men sufficiently trained to fight when the opportunity should come. This system was later adopted by other European states and was the basis of the great armies of the Continent at the outbreak of the World War in 1914.

**341. The German National Spirit Aroused.** While serfdom and the old system of social classes were being abolished in Prussia, attempts were being made to rouse the national spirit of the Germans and prepare them to fight against their French conquerors. A leader in this movement was the well-known philosopher Fichte. He arranged a course of public addresses in Berlin, just after the defeat at Jena, in which he laid the foundation for a rapid increase of German patriotism.

He told his auditors, with impressive warmth and eloquence, that the Germans were the one really superior people in the whole world. All other nations were degraded and had, he was confident, seen their best days; but the future belonged to the Germans, who would in due time, owing to their supreme natural gifts, come into their own and be recognized as the leaders of the world. The German language was, he claimed, infinitely stronger than the feeble speech of the French and Italians, borrowed from ancient Latin. Later German writers, economists, philosophers, and clergymen followed Fichte's lead in cultivating the Germans' self-esteem and arousing the hope that they might become strong enough to protect Germany from invasions such as she had so long suffered.

The University of Berlin, which, before the World War, was one of the largest institutions in the world, was founded in the interest of higher education. Four hundred and fifty-eight students registered the first year (1810-1811). A League of Virtue was formed to foster fidelity to the Fatherland and to cultivate

hatred of Napoleon and the French. In this way the Prussian people were roused to attack and expel their foreign oppressors.

342. **Opening of the War of Liberation.** Napoleon had to face now not only the kings and the cabinets of Europe and the regular armies that they directed but a people who were being organized to defend their country. The campaign which followed is known in Prussia as the War of Liberation. Napoleon's soldiers were, however, still triumphant for a time. He met with no successful opposition, and on May 14, 1813, he occupied Dresden in the territory of his faithful ally, the king of Saxony. This he held during the summer and inflicted several defeats upon the allies, who had been joined by Austria in August. He gained his last great victory, the battle of Dresden, August 26-27.

343. **Battle of Leipzig, October 16-19, 1813.** Finding that the allied armies of the Russians, Prussians, and Austrians, which had at last learned the necessity of cooperating against their powerful common enemy, were preparing to cut him off from France, he retreated early in October and was totally defeated in the tremendous "Battle of the Nations," as the Germans love to call it, in the environs of Leipzig (October 16-19).



FIG. 44. MONUMENT OF THE "BATTLE OF THE NATIONS," LEIPZIG

This massive structure, rising about four hundred feet above the plain, took fifteen years to build. It was solemnly inaugurated by Emperor William II in October, 1913, to celebrate the centenary of the battle



As the defeated emperor crossed the Rhine with the remnants of his army the various new states he had created in Germany and Holland collapsed. The members of the Confederation of the Rhine joined the allies. Jerome Bonaparte fled from his kingdom of Westphalia, and the Dutch drove the French officials from Holland. During the year 1813 the Spanish, with the aid of the English under Wellington, had practically cleared their country of the French intruders.

6. avril 1814.

*Les puissances alliées ayant déclaré que l'empereur napoléon est l'obstacle  
 unique qui empêche le rétablissement de la paix en Europe, l'empereur, fidèle à son serment,  
 déclare qu'il renonce, pour lui-même et pour ses successeurs, aux trônes de France et d'Italie, et que, fidèle à son serment,  
 il n'est pas prêt à faire aucun sacrifice personnel, même celui de sa vie, pour les intérêts de la France.*

FIG. 45. THE ABDICATION OF NAPOLEON—THE DOCUMENT IN HIS OWN HANDWRITING<sup>1</sup>

344. Occupation of Paris by the Allies, March 31, 1814. In spite of these disasters Napoleon refused the propositions of peace made on condition that he would content himself henceforth with his dominion over France. The allies consequently marched into France, and the almost superhuman activity of the hard-pressed emperor could not prevent their occupation of Paris (March 31, 1814). Napoleon was forced to abdicate, and the allies, in seeming derision, granted him full sovereignty over the tiny island of Elba and permitted him to retain his imperial title. In reality he was a prisoner on his island kingdom, and the Bourbons, in the person of Louis XVIII, reigned again in France.

<sup>1</sup> The document in translation reads as follows: "The allied powers having proclaimed that the Emperor Napoleon was the sole obstacle to the reëstablishment of peace in Europe, the Emperor, faithful to his oath, proclaims that he renounces, for himself and his successors, the thrones of France and of Italy, and that, faithful to his oath, there is no personal sacrifice, even that of life, that he is not ready to make for the interests of France."

**345. Return of Napoleon.** Within a year, encouraged by the dissensions of the allies and the unpopularity of the Bourbons, he made his escape, landed in France (March 1, 1815), and was received with enthusiasm by a portion of the army. Yet France



FIG. 46. THE RETURN OF NAPOLEON FROM ELBA

Napoleon landed almost alone in France, but had a triumphal march to Paris. The old soldiers of the armies of the empire responded to his call, and even those sent against him yielded to the spell of his personality and joined his small but growing army. Louis XVIII fled from Paris and took refuge with the allies until Waterloo ended this last great adventure of Napoleon, one hundred days later. The period is often known as "The Hundred Days"

as a whole was indifferent, if not hostile, to his attempt to re-establish his power. Certainly no one could place confidence in his talk of peace and liberty. Moreover, whatever disagreement there might be among the allies on other matters, there was perfect unanimity in their attitude toward "the enemy and destroyer of the world's peace." They solemnly proclaimed him an outlaw and devoted him to the public vengeance.

**346. Battle of Waterloo, June, 1815.** Upon learning that English troops under Wellington, the hero of the Peninsular War,

and a Prussian army under Blücher, a hero of the War of Liberation, had arrived in the Netherlands, Napoleon decided to attack them with such troops as he could collect. In the first engagements he defeated and drove back the Prussians. Wellington then took his station south of Brussels, at Waterloo. Napoleon advanced against him (June 18, 1815) but was unable to defeat the English and was finally routed when Blücher's Prussians arrived to aid Wellington. Thus Napoleon lost one of the most memorable of modern battles.




FIG. 47. TOMB OF NAPOLEON

Napoleon died at Saint Helena in 1821. The body was brought to Paris in 1840 and placed with great military splendor in this sarcophagus of reddish-brown granite, which was hewn in Finland as a solid block, weighing sixty-seven tons. Around it in the pavement are inscribed the names of Napoleon's greatest victories, while some sixty captured banners stand beside colossal statues of victory. The whole tomb is under the gilded dome of the church of the old soldiers' hospital, known as the Invalides, which rises one hundred and sixty-one feet above it<sup>1</sup>

**347. Exile of Napoleon to Saint Helena.** Yet, even if he had not been defeated at Waterloo, he could not long have opposed the vast armies which were being concentrated to overthrow him. This time he was banished to the remote island of St.

Helena, where he could only brood over the past and prepare his *Memoirs*, in which he carefully strove to justify his career of ambition.

<sup>1</sup> The interior of General Grant's tomb in New York was obviously suggested by that of Napoleon.



QUESTIONS

I. Tell something of the early life of Napoleon Bonaparte. What powers were at war with France when Bonaparte took command of the Italian army? With what success did Bonaparte meet in Italy? Describe Bonaparte's character. What were the chief sources of his power?

II. What were Bonaparte's motives in going to Egypt? Describe the Egyptian and Syrian expeditions. How did Bonaparte become First Consul? What is the origin of the word "consul"? Why was Bonaparte popular? What were his first measures?

III. Describe Bonaparte's second expedition to Italy and its results. How did Louisiana come into the hands of the United States? Describe the general nature of the Holy Roman Empire. Had the emperors tried in previous centuries to strengthen Germany? What were the circumstances that led to the consolidation of Germany in 1803? In what way was Napoleon responsible for the later German Empire? What is meant by "secularization"? Give some examples.

IV. How did Bonaparte adjust the relations of France to the Church? What did he do about the runaway nobles? What was the *Code Napoléon*? Why did Bonaparte want to be called Napoleon I? Why do despotic monarchs dislike a free press?

V. Why did Napoleon believe that he would be constantly involved in war? What was the extent of French territory when war was renewed in 1803? What were the sources of Napoleon's dislike for England? Describe the final dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire.

VI. How did Prussia become involved in war with France in 1806, and what were the results? What was the continental blockade? What was the policy of the United States? Illustrate the difficulties of neutral nations during a great war. How did Napoleon hope to make the Continent independent of English commerce?

VII. What did Napoleon do for Paris? What were Napoleon's ideas of education? Do you know of any modern state that had similar views? What was the result of Napoleon's attempt to add Spain to his empire? How were the French boundaries extended after the war with Austria in 1809? Why did Napoleon marry an Austrian princess?

VIII. Why did Napoleon undertake his Russian expedition? What reforms were carried through in Prussia as a result of her defeat by Napoleon? Tell something of the campaign of 1813. Why do the Germans call the battle of Leipzig the "Battle of the Nations"? What was the end of Napoleon's career in Europe? What does Europe owe to Napoleon?



## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) how Bonaparte made himself master of France, pp. 320-326, 333-337, 351-352; (2) the peace of Lunéville, pp. 329-332; (3) the end of the Holy Roman Empire, pp. 340-345; (4) the downfall of Napoleon, pp. 356-371.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Napoleon Bonaparte, Duke of Wellington, Blockade, Waterloo (campaign of), J. G. Fichte, Immanuel Kant, and Baron Stein.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the Consulate, pp. 523-533; (2) the French Empire and territorial expansion, pp. 534-544; (3) the destruction of the French Empire, pp. 544-573.

Draw a map of Europe at the time of Napoleon's greatest power, based on Lesson VII of BISHOP and ROBINSON, *Practical Map Exercises in Medieval and Modern European History*.





FIG. 48. THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

*BOOK IV. FROM THE CONGRESS OF  
VIENNA TO THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN  
WAR (1815-1870)*

CHAPTER X

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE AT THE  
CONGRESS OF VIENNA

I. THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA AND ITS WORK

348. **The European Situation in 1815.** The readjustment of the map of Europe after Napoleon's downfall was an extremely perplexing and delicate operation. Boundary lines centuries old had been swept away by the storms of war and the ambition of the conqueror. Many ancient states had disappeared altogether—Venice, Genoa, Piedmont, the Papal States, Holland, and scores of little German principalities. These had been either merged into France or the realms of their more fortunate neighbors or formed into new countries—the kingdom of Italy, the kingdom of Westphalia, the Confederation of the Rhine, the grand duchy of Warsaw. Those older states which had survived had, with the exception of England and Russia, received new bounds, new rulers, or new institutions. When Napoleon was forced to abdicate, the princes whose former realms had vanished from the map, or who had been thrust aside, clamored to be restored to their thrones. The great powers,—England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia,—whose rulers had finally combined to bring about his overthrow, naturally assumed the chief part in the settlement. But they were far from impartial judges, since each proposed to gain for itself the greatest possible advantages in the reapportionment of territory.



**349. The Bourbons Restored.** The least troublesome points were settled by the allies in the first Treaty of Paris, which had been concluded in May, 1814, immediately after Napoleon had been sent to Elba. They readily agreed, for instance, that the Bourbon dynasty should be restored to the throne of France in the person of Louis XVI's brother, the count of Provence, who took the title of Louis XVIII.<sup>1</sup> They at first permitted France to retain the boundaries she had had on November 1, 1792, but later deprived her of Savoy as a penalty for yielding to Napoleon after his return from Elba.<sup>2</sup> The powers also agreed, at Paris, upon a kingdom of the Netherlands, with increased territories, to be established under the House of Orange; the union of Germany into a confederation of sovereign states; the independence of Switzerland; and the restoration of the former monarchs of Italy. The graver issues and the details of the settlement were left to the consideration of the great congress which was to assemble at Vienna in the autumn.

**350. The Kingdom of Holland Created.** This Congress of Vienna continued the old policy of carving out and distributing states—especially the smaller ones—without regard to the wishes of the people concerned. The allies confirmed their former decision that Holland should become an hereditary kingdom under the House of Orange, which had so long played a conspicuous rôle in the Dutch republic. In order that Holland might be better able to check any encroachments on the part of France, the Austrian Netherlands (which had been seized by the French Convention early in the revolutionary wars) were joined to the new Dutch kingdom. The fact that most of the inhabitants of the Austrian Netherlands were not closely connected by language,<sup>3</sup> traditions,

<sup>1</sup> The young son of Louis XVI had been imprisoned by the Convention and, according to reports, maltreated by the jailers set to guard him. His fate has been a fruitful theme of historical discussion, but it is probable that he died in 1795. Though he never exercised power in any form, he takes his place in the line of French kings as Louis XVII.

<sup>2</sup> The second Peace of Paris (November, 1815) also provided for the return of the works of art and manuscripts which Napoleon had carried off from Venice, Milan, Rome, Naples, and elsewhere. But not all were returned.

<sup>3</sup> About half the people of Belgium to-day speak French, while the remainder use Flemish, a dialect akin to Dutch.




FIG. 49. THREE IMPORTANT MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA



or religion with the Dutch was ignored, just as it had been in former times when the provinces had passed to Spain by inheritance and, later, to Austria by conquest.

**351. Germany Consolidated.** The territorial settlement of Germany did not prove to be so difficult as might have been expected. No one except the former princes and the church rulers desired to undo the work of 1803 and restore the old minute subdivisions which had been done away with by the *Reichsdeputationshauptschluss* (§ 290). The restoration of the Holy Roman Empire could not be seriously considered by anyone, but all felt the need of some sort of union between the surviving thirty-eight German states. A very loose union was therefore created, which permitted the former members of the Confederation of the Rhine to continue to enjoy that precious "sovereignty" which Napoleon had granted them. Formerly that portion of Germany which lies on the Rhine had been so broken up into little states that it was a constant temptation to any strong power to take advantage of this weakness to encroach upon German territory. After 1815 this source of weakness was partially remedied, for Prussia was assigned a large tract on the Rhine, while Baden, Württemberg, and Bavaria stood by her side to discourage any new invasions on the part of foreign powers.

**352. Chaos in Italy under Austrian Predominance.** Italy, however, was not so fortunate in securing greater unity than she had enjoyed before the French Revolution. Napoleon had reduced and consolidated her various divisions into the kingdom of Italy, of which he was the head, and the kingdom of Naples, which he had finally bestowed on Murat; while Piedmont, Genoa, Tuscany, and the Papal States he had annexed to France.<sup>1</sup> Naturally the powers had no reason for maintaining this arrangement and determined to restore all the deposed Italian rulers. Tuscany, Modena, the Papal States, and Naples were given back to their former princes, and little Parma was assigned to Napoleon's second wife, the Austrian princess, Maria Louisa. The king of Sardinia

<sup>1</sup> Nothing need be said of a half dozen petty Italian territories — Lucca, San Marino, Benevento, etc.



returned from his island and reëstablished himself in Turin. There were few at the congress to plead for a revival of the ancient republics of Genoa and Venice. The lands of the former were



FIG. 50. GENERAL BERNADOTTE, KING CHARLES XIV OF SWEDEN

The son of a lawyer in southern France, Bernadotte (1763-1844) won his way in the French army by merit and was one of Napoleon's greatest marshals. In 1810 he was surprised by the news that some Swedish statesmen were proposing him as successor to the throne, owing to his kindness to Swedish prisoners he had once taken, and also in order to secure Sweden against Russia by having a warrior king, a good friend of Napoleon. Elected, he became very popular, and after the Napoleonic wars his reign was peaceful

bound them together into a Swiss federation consisting of twenty-two little states, which continues to exist to-day.

**354. The Union of Norway and Sweden.** The Congress of Vienna ratified an arrangement by which Sweden and Norway

therefore added to those of the king of Sardinia, in order to make as firm a bulwark as possible against France. Austria deemed the territories of Venice a fair compensation for the loss of the Netherlands and was accordingly permitted to add Venetia to her old duchy of Milan and thus form a new Austrian province in northern Italy, the so-called Lombardo-Venetian kingdom.

**353. Switzerland.** Switzerland gave the allies but little trouble. The Congress of Vienna recognized the cantons as all free and equal and established their "neutrality" by agreeing never to invade Switzerland or send troops through her territory. The cantons (which had been joined by the former free city of Geneva) then drew up a new constitution, which

were joined under a single ruler, one of Napoleon's generals, Bernadotte. The Norwegians protested, drew up a constitution of their own, and elected a king, but Bernadotte induced them to accept him as their ruler on condition that Norway should have its own separate constitution and government. This was the origin of the "personal union"<sup>1</sup> of Sweden and Norway under Bernadotte and his successors, which lasted until October, 1905.<sup>2</sup>

**355. The Plans of Russia and Prussia.** In these adjustments all was fairly harmonious, but when it came to the awards claimed by Russia and Prussia there developed at the congress serious differences of opinion which nearly brought on war between the allies themselves and which encouraged Napoleon's return from Elba. Russia desired the grand duchy of Warsaw, which Napoleon had formed principally out of the territory seized by Austria and Prussia in the partitions of the previous century. The Tsar proposed to increase this duchy by the addition of a portion of Russian Poland and so form a kingdom to be united in a personal union with his other dominions. The king of Prussia agreed to this plan on condition that in return for the loss of such a large portion of his former Polish territories he should be allowed to annex the lands of the king of Saxony, who, it was argued, had deserved this punishment for remaining faithful to Napoleon after the other members of the Confederation of the Rhine had deserted him.

**356. The Opposition of the Other Powers.** Austria and England, on the other hand, were opposed to this arrangement. They did not approve of dispossessing the king of Saxony or of extending the Tsar's influence westward by giving him Poland; and Austria had special grounds for objection because a large portion

<sup>1</sup> This is the term applied in international law to describe the union of two or more independent states under a single ruler.

<sup>2</sup> This personal union worked very well until nearly the close of the nineteenth century, when the interests of the two countries diverged too widely. With the development of parliamentary government the diets of both countries desired to control the king's choice of ministers and the foreign policy of the two kingdoms. So, after a long period of friction, the two states agreed to separate on October 26, 1905. Sweden retained her old king, Oscar II (1872-1907), while Norway elected as king Prince Carl, second son of Frederick, king of Denmark, and gave him the title of Haakon VII. The Norwegians still retain the constitution which was drawn up in 1814, but it has been several times modified by extending the right to vote.


of the duchy of Warsaw which the Tsar proposed to take had formerly belonged to her.

**357. Skillful Diplomacy of Talleyrand.** The great French diplomatist Talleyrand now saw his chance to disturb the good will existing between England, Prussia, Austria, and Russia. The allies had resolved to treat France as a black sheep and arrange everything to suit themselves. But now that they were hopelessly at odds Austria and England found the hitherto discredited France a welcome ally. Acting with the consent of Louis XVIII, Talleyrand offered to Austria the aid of French arms in resisting the proposal of Russia and Prussia, and on January 3, 1815, France, England, and Austria joined in a secret treaty against Russia and Prussia, and even went so far as to draw up a plan of campaign. So France, who had stood apart for the last quarter of a century, was received back into the family of nations, and the French ambassador joyfully announced to his king that the coalition against France was dissolved forever.

**358. The Gains of Russia and Prussia.** A compromise was, however, at length arranged without resorting to arms. The Tsar gave up a small portion of the duchy of Warsaw, but was allowed to create the kingdom of Poland on which he had set his heart. Only about one half of the possessions of the king of Saxony were ceded to Prussia, but as a further indemnity Prussia received certain districts on the left bank of the Rhine, which had belonged to minor princes before the Peace of Lunéville. This proved an important gain for Prussia, although it was not considered so at the time. It gave her a large number of German subjects in exchange for the Poles she lost, and so prepared the way for her to become the dominant power in Germany.

## II. RESULTS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD: NATIONALISM

**359. Map of Europe in 1815.** If one compares the map of Europe as it was reconstructed by the representatives of the great powers at Vienna with the situation after the Treaty of Utrecht a hundred years before, several very important changes are







**EUROPE**

**AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA**  
**1815**

X Locations of important battlefields

SCALE OF MILES

0 50 100 150 200

52°

48°

44°

4°

8°

12° Longitude East from



16°

20°

24°

28°

32°

52°

48°

44°

16°

20°

24°

28°



apparent. A general consolidation had been effected. Holland and the Austrian Netherlands were united under one king. The Holy Roman Empire, with its hundreds of petty principalities, had disappeared and a union of thirty-eight states and free towns had taken its place. Prussia had greatly increased the extent of its German territories, although these remained rather scattered. The kingdom of Poland had reappeared on the map, but had lost its independence and been reduced in extent. Portions of it had fallen to Prussia and Austria, but the great mass of Polish territory was now brought under the control of the Tsar, who was no longer regarded by the western nations as an eastern potentate, but was regularly admitted to their councils. Austria had lost her outlying provinces of the Netherlands, which had proved so troublesome, but had been indemnified by the lands of the extinct Venetian republic, while her future rival in Italy, the king of Sardinia, had been strengthened by receiving the important city of Genoa and the adjacent territory. Otherwise Italy remained in her former state of disruption and more completely than ever under the control of Austria.

**360. The Colonial Gains of England.** The gains of England resulting from the Napoleonic conflict, like all her other acquisitions since the War of the Spanish Succession, were colonial. The most important of these were Ceylon, off the southeastern coast of the Indian peninsula, and the Cape of Good Hope. The latter had been wrested from the Dutch (1806) while Holland was under Napoleon's influence. This seemingly insignificant conquest proved to be the basis of further British expansion, which has secured for England the most valuable portions of southern Africa.<sup>1</sup>

**361. Extent of England's Colonial Possessions in 1815.** In spite of the loss of the American colonies on the eve of the French Revolution, England possessed in 1815 the foundations of the

<sup>1</sup> England also received from France the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, east of Madagascar; Tobago, a small island north of the mouth of the Orinoco River; and Saint Lucia, one of the Windward Islands. From Spain England got the island of Trinidad, and from Denmark the island of Heligoland, commanding the mouth of the Elbe (ceded to Germany in 1890). In the Mediterranean England held Malta and, as a protectorate, the Ionian Islands off the coast of Greece, thus securing a basis for operations in the eastern Mediterranean.



greatest commercial and colonial power which has ever existed. She still held Canada and all the vast northwest of the North American continent except Alaska. Important islands in the West Indies furnished stations from which a profitable trade with South America could be carried on. In Gibraltar she had a sentinel at the gateway of the Mediterranean, and the possession of the Cape of Good Hope afforded not only a basis for pressing into the heart of the most habitable part of Africa but also a halfway port for vessels bound to distant India. In India the beginnings of empire had already been made in the Bengal region and along the east and west coasts. Finally, in Australia, far away in the southern Pacific, convict settlements had been made which were in time to be succeeded by rich, populous, and prosperous commonwealths. In addition to her colonial strength England possessed the most formidable navy and the largest mercantile marine afloat.

**362. The Slave Trade Condemned.** The Congress of Vienna marks the condemnation of one of the most atrocious practices which Europe had inherited from ancient times, namely, the slave trade.<sup>1</sup> The congress itself did no more than declare the traffic contrary to the principles of civilization and human rights, but under the leadership of England the various states, with the exception of Spain and Portugal, were already busy doing away with the trade in human beings. The horrors of the business had roused the conscience of the more enlightened and humane Englishmen and Frenchmen in the eighteenth century. Finally, in March, 1807, three weeks after the Congress of the United States had forbidden the importation of slaves, Parliament prohibited Englishmen from engaging in the traffic.<sup>2</sup> Sweden followed England's example in 1813, and Holland a year later. Napoleon, on

<sup>1</sup> The slave trade had been greatly stimulated by the discovery that African slaves could be profitably used to cultivate the vast plantations of the New World. The English navigator Hawkins had carried a cargo of three hundred negroes from Sierra Leone to Hispania in 1562 and so introduced English seamen to a business in which Portugal, Spain, and Holland were already engaged. It is estimated that previous to 1776 at least three million slaves had been imported into French, Spanish, and English colonies, while at least a quarter of a million more had perished during the voyages.

<sup>2</sup> England abolished slavery throughout all her colonies in 1833.

his return from Elba, in order to gain if possible the confidence of England, abolished the French slave trade.

**363. Disregard of Nationality before the Nineteenth Century.** Napoleon had done more than alter the map of Europe and introduce such reforms in the countries under his control as suited his purposes; he had aroused the modern *spirit of nationality*, which is one of the forces that helped to make the nineteenth century different from the eighteenth. Before the French Revolution kings went to war without consulting their subjects and made arrangements with other monarchs in regard to the distribution, division, and annexation of territory without asking the consent of those who lived in the regions involved. Practically no attention was paid to differences in race, for kings gladly added to their realms any lands they could gain by conquest, negotiation, marriage, or inheritance, regardless of the particular kind of subjects that they might bring under their scepters.

**364. National Control of Lawmaking.** However, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789 had proclaimed that the law was the expression of the general will and that every citizen had a right, personally or through his representatives, to participate in its formation. The king and his officials were made responsible for their public acts not to God but to the people. This idea that the nation had a right to control the making of the laws and the granting of the taxes and to choose or depose its ruler, who was responsible to it, served to arouse a general interest in political questions, which could not possibly have developed as long as people were content to believe that God had excluded them from all participation in affairs of State. Political leaders appeared, the newspapers began to discuss public questions, and political societies were formed.

**365. The Awakening of Nationalism.** The various nations became more and more keenly conscious that each had its own language and traditions which made it different from other peoples. Patriotic orators in Germany, Italy, and Greece recalled the glorious past of the ancient Germans, Romans, and Hellenes, with a view to stimulating this enthusiasm. National feeling may be

defined as a general recognition that a people should have a government suited to its particular traditions and needs and should be ruled by its own native officials, and that (if nations were entitled to political rights, as the French Revolution had taught) it is wrong for one people to dominate another or for monarchs to divide, redistribute, and transfer territories with no regard to the wishes of the inhabitants, merely to provide some landless prince with a realm.

We shall have to reckon hereafter with this national spirit, which continued to spread and to increase in strength during the nineteenth century. It has played a great part in the unification of Italy and Germany, in the emancipation of Greece and the Balkan States from Turkish dominion, and finally in the causes and results of the World War of 1914.

### III. THE HOLY ALLIANCE: METTERNICH BECOMES THE CHIEF OPPONENT OF REVOLUTION

**366. Revolution and Reform Discredited.** In June, 1815, the Congress of Vienna brought together the results of all the treaties and arrangements which its various members had agreed upon among themselves and issued its "Final Act," in which its work was summed up for convenient reference. A few days later the battle of Waterloo and the subsequent exile of Napoleon freed the powers from their chief cause of anxiety during the preceding fifteen years. No wonder that the restored monarchs, as they composed themselves upon their thrones and reviewed the wars and turmoil which had begun with the French Revolution and lasted more than a quarter of a century, longed for peace at any cost and viewed with the utmost suspicion any individual or party who ventured to suggest further changes. The word "revolution" had acquired a hideous sound not only to the rulers and their immediate advisers but to all the aristocratic class and the clergy, who thought that they had reason enough to abhor the modern tendencies as they had seen them at work. These classes often worked for a restoration of the old institutions which had been abolished.

**367. The Holy Alliance (September, 1815).** It was clear that the powers which had combined to reëstablish order must continue their alliance if they hoped to maintain the arrangements they had made and stifle the fires of revolution which were sure to break out at some unexpected point unless the most constant vigilance was exercised. Alexander I proposed a plan for preserving European tranquillity by the formation of a religious brotherhood of monarchs, which was given the name of "the Holy Alliance." This was accepted by the emperor of Austria and the king of Prussia and published in September, 1815. In this singular document their majesties agreed to view one another as brothers and compatriots, as "delegates of Providence to govern three branches of the same family." All the other European powers who were willing to recognize the sacred principles of the compact were to be welcomed cordially and affectionately into this "holy alliance."

The Tsar and Frederick William took the alliance seriously, but to most of the diplomats who had participated in the scramble for the spoils at Vienna, and who looked back upon the habits of monarchs in dealing with one another, it was an amusing vagary of the Tsar. It was not, as has often been supposed, a conspiracy of despotic monarchs to repress all liberal movements. It contained no definite allusions to the dangers of revolution or to the necessity of maintaining the settlement of Vienna. The name "Holy Alliance" came mistakenly to be applied by the more liberal newspapers and reformers to a real and effective organization—the Quadruple Alliance—which the powers arranged after the Congress of Vienna. In this case the monarchs did not unite in "the name of the Most High" to promote Christian love, but frankly combined to fight against reform, under the worldly guidance of Clement Wencelaus Nepomuk Lothaire, Prince of Metternich-Winneburg-Ochsenhausen (see § 369).

**368. Metternich's Political Creed.** Metternich, who was destined to succeed Napoleon as the most conspicuous statesman in Europe, was born in 1773 and had followed the course of the French Revolution from the beginning with hatred and alarm.




All talk about constitutions and national unity was to him revolutionary and therefore highly dangerous. He led the forces of reaction for a whole generation, 1815–1848.

He was doubtless much strengthened in his hostility to reform by the situation of Austria, whose affairs he had been guiding since 1809. No country, except Prussia, had suffered more from the Revolution, which it had been the first to oppose in 1792. Should the idea of nationality gain ground, the various peoples included in the Austrian Empire—Germans, Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Italians, and the rest—would surely revolt and each demand its own constitution. Liberal ideas, whether in Austria, Italy, or Germany, threatened the destruction of the highly artificial Austrian realms, which had been accumulated through the centuries by conquest, marriage, and inheritance, without regard to the great differences between the races which were gathered together under the scepter of Francis I. Consequently, to Metternich the preservation of Austria, the suppression of reformers and of agitators for constitutional government, and “the tranquillity of Europe” all meant one and the same thing.

**369. The Quadruple Alliance.** On November 20, 1815, Austria, Prussia, England, and Russia entered into a secret agreement to keep peace in Europe. In order to effect their ends the powers agreed to hold periodical meetings with a view to considering their common interests and taking such measures as might be expedient for the preservation of general order. Thus a sort of international congress was established for the purpose of upholding the settlement of Vienna.

The first formal meeting of the powers under this agreement took place at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, to arrange for the evacuation of France by the troops of the allies, which had been stationed there since 1814 to suppress any possible disorder. France, once more admitted to the brotherhood of nations, joined Metternich’s conservative league, for fighting revolution, and that judicious statesman could report with pride and confidence that the whole conference had proved a brilliant triumph for those principles which he held dearest.



IV. THOUGHT AND CULTURE AT THE OPENING OF THE  
NINETEENTH CENTURY

**370. The Importance of Social History.** It must not be imagined that, because histories deal almost exclusively with the politics of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods, the people of that time were continually and completely immersed in wars and treaties. During all these years artisans worked at their trades, farmers gathered in their harvests and grumbled at high prices and the weather, manufacturers were seeking new markets, and inventors were contriving new machines to do the world's work. For instance, just as Napoleon was landing from Elba for his desperate adventure which ended at Waterloo, a poor young fireman at a Newcastle colliery, named George Stephenson, was perfecting the locomotive, by which vaster continents were to be conquered for the arts of peace than even Napoleon ever dreamed of. The changes in industry and the methods of work due to the application of science, which were taking place at that time, is so large a subject that we shall describe it by itself (below, Chapter XII). But alongside the busy, unresting world of commerce and industry there are other fields of achievement hardly less important—those of literature, art, and philosophy. In all of these, great masters were at work through the whole period just described.

**371. The Influence of the Classics upon Literature.** During the eighteenth century the literatures of all Europe were profoundly under the influence of the culture of France. The poetry was stately and formal, such as Dryden and Pope wrote in England; the prose, although often witty and clever, seems to us, nowadays, rather artificial and affected. This was due partly to the fact that ever since the work of the Humanists of the Renaissance (Vol. I, § 701) education had been largely taken up with studying the Greek and Latin classics. Ancient masters of rhetoric like Cicero were imitated by all writers of correct prose, and the tranquil dignity of Vergil's poetry furnished the model for thousands of rather monotonous lines of courtly verse. These writers used only a limited number of words, which were sanctioned by

good taste as properly belonging to literature. In the choice of subjects too they were limited, for this lofty, "classical" style was regarded as suited only to lofty subjects. The result was that literature did not deal with the common affairs of daily life as it does now, but with somewhat unreal events and persons, generally the heroes and heroines of antiquity. In the hands of a master like Voltaire one did not feel the restraint which such formality imposed, but, upon the whole, the effect was to make both prose and poetry commonplace.<sup>1</sup> Rousseau's great success as a writer had been partly due to his passionate revolt against the stiffness and formality which French good taste had insisted upon.

**372. Nature and Naturalness in Literature.** Britain had no Rousseau, but the popularity of Robert Burns, the plowman poet, and of Wordsworth and his friends who sought to "get back to nature" was a sign of the same kind of revolt against artificiality. It also pointed to the rise of a different audience than that of noble patrons for whose favor and gold authors formerly wrote; namely, the great middle class now rapidly acquiring wealth and the leisure to read.

**373. Romanticism.** At the opening of the nineteenth century, and especially after the Napoleonic wars, this new reading public was entertained by a fresh theme—the romantic glorification of the past. During the eighteenth century and the Revolutionary era the past had been decried, and people looked forward to the future for inspiration. Now writers turned to the despised Middle Ages and depicted in glowing terms the picturesque life of feudal times. One of the main leaders in this movement, which is called Romanticism, was Sir Walter Scott, whose poems and novels of the days of chivalry were read everywhere. The movement spread through France<sup>2</sup> and Germany. It fitted admirably with the conservative ideas of the period after Waterloo, and yet even its extravagant praise of the past, which, to progressive minds,

<sup>1</sup> A clever writer like Voltaire could manage to make one see that, while pretending to talk about an ancient king, he often had the king of France and present politics in mind. In this way he could poke fun at absurdities in his own day or denounce them roundly without being forbidden by the censor.

<sup>2</sup> In France one of the greatest Romanticists was Victor Hugo.






FIG. 51. THREE MEN WHOSE WORKS WERE WIDELY POPULAR IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY





seemed to obscure the duties of the present, had one important result—the rise of scientific history.

**374. The Modern Historians.** The past which the Romantists wrote about was an unreal world, largely the creation of their imagination, where noble warriors and fair ladies were heroes and heroines, where even the cruelty and triviality of their lives were touched with the attraction of romance. But this attraction led others to study the past more critically, and scientific scholars set to work deciphering documents in dusty libraries in order to find out the truth. The historians of continental Europe began the great task of recovering the sources of their national history. As this scientific work was extended to cover ancient times as well, the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been enabled to know more about the history of civilization than any previous age. Such manuals as this could not have been written but for the patient labor of these great scholars,<sup>1</sup> to whose works it is hoped that it may offer an introduction.

**375. German Literature.** The rise of the modern German literature, which reached its climax in the works of Goethe,<sup>2</sup> is all the more remarkable when we recall that, as recently as the days of Frederick the Great, German had not been regarded as a literary language. Frederick had written his poems and books in French. It was only after his victories had given a new self-confidence to the North Germans that they ventured to use the tongue of Luther as a rival to that of the court of Versailles. Thus the rapid rise of German literature is of great importance in the creation of that powerful national feeling upon which the German military party played with such terrible effect in after years.

**376. The New Age of Reading.** It is clear that with the rise of the middle class and the great increase in the number of readers

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that their work is by no means done. History is not an unchanging repetition of an old tale. It is, like any other branch of learning, a constantly changing body of facts. Until recently it was largely a branch of literature, with emphasis upon the picturesque or dramatic. Now it is tending to pay more attention to everyday interests and commonplace things (see below, Chapter XXVII, §§ 910-914).

<sup>2</sup> Pronounced *gœ'te*. The greater part of his life (1749-1832) was spent at the small court of the Duke of Weimar. He was not much disturbed by the conquests of Napoleon and cannot be counted among the distinctively patriotic Germans of his day.

a new era dawned at the opening of the nineteenth century in the literatures of Europe. In addition to the histories, the poetry, and the novels, which for the first time began to attract thousands of readers, newspapers and other periodicals began to take the place of pamphlets. Improvements in the printing press made it possible to print as many as eight hundred pages in an hour,<sup>1</sup> instead of a few score, and so the great age of reading began.

**377. Free Public Schools.** This involved more education. In the eighteenth century the mass of the inhabitants of Europe could not read or write. Education was largely in the hands of the clergy and, beyond a grounding in the merest rudiments, was generally confined to the well-to-do. In France an attempt had been made during the Reign of Terror to establish a national free public-school system, but it was not carried out. In England little was done to improve matters until the second half of the nineteenth century. There had long been Church schools and some endowed ones, which had received some financial support from the government; but in 1870 a system of compulsory free education was introduced, with free public elementary schools in every school district.

**378. Prussian Education System.** In Prussia a new school system was part of the work of regeneration begun by the group of men around Stein, of whom Karl Wilhelm Humboldt was a distinguished leader. The founding of the University of Berlin in 1810 was one of the most noticeable events in this important movement. Before the opening of the World War in 1914 the German universities attracted many students of other nations. But the attitude of German professors, who almost without exception supported and defended the policy of their government, roused the suspicion among foreigners that the government control of education, whether in Germany or elsewhere, may tend to discourage a scientific discussion of existing social evils and dangers.

<sup>1</sup> Now there are presses which can print almost one hundred thousand newspapers an hour, consuming paper at the rate of seven hundred miles an hour.




FIG. 52. COUNT RUMFORD

One of the most distinguished pioneers in the development of Germany was Benjamin Thompson, who won the title Count Rumford for his services to the elector of Bavaria in the years just before the French Revolution. Like Benjamin Franklin, he combined a scientific genius with great statesmanlike qualities, only in his case these were devoted to a foreign country. Rumford's life reads like a romance. Born in 1753, the son of a Massachusetts farmer, he left for England at the time of the Revolution. There he held public office and at the same time carried on scientific experiments. Going to fight against the Turks, he was given the post of minister by the elector of Bavaria. He boldly advocated reforms in government so that problems of social welfare, such as the care of the poor and the treatment of criminals, or the development of the country's resources, should be met by scientific study instead of by old-fashioned remedies. It is part of the romance that when he was made a count of the Holy Roman Empire he chose as his title the name of the little village of Rumford, now Concord, New Hampshire, where his wife's home had been





### QUESTIONS

I. Outline the arrangement made by the Treaty of Paris. Describe the work of territorial redistribution at the Congress of Vienna. Give an account of Talleyrand's diplomacy. What was the result of the compromise between Russia and Prussia?

II. Describe the map of Europe in 1715 as contrasted with that in 1815. What colonial possessions were gained by England in 1815? Account for the awakening of the spirit of nationality in the early nineteenth century.

III. What was the Holy Alliance? Describe Metternich's political aims. Who were the members and what was the purpose of the quadruple alliance formed November 20, 1815?

IV. What effect did the study of the Greek and Latin classics have upon the style of authors in the eighteenth century? When and how did writers begin to write differently? What is Romanticism? Describe Goethe's views. Why is reading so much more common than formerly? What danger is there in the government control of schools and universities?

### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. I: (1) the work of the Congress of Vienna, pp. 372-384; (2) the Holy Alliance, pp. 384-387.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Vienna (Congress of), Metternich, Talleyrand, Alexander I (of Russia), Holy Alliance, Romanticism, Robert Burns, and Sir Walter Scott.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. I: (1) the reconstruction of Europe at Vienna, pp. 5-14; (2) the Bourbon restoration in France, pp. 14-20; (3) reaction in Great Britain, pp. 28-37; (4) autocracy in Central Europe, pp. 41-46.

Draw a map of Europe in 1715 and one of Europe in 1815, based on Lessons V and VIII of BISHOP and ROBINSON, *Practical Map Exercises in Medieval and Modern European History*.

## CHAPTER XI

### REACTION AND REVOLUTION AFTER THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

#### I. THE RESTORATION OF THE BOURBONS IN FRANCE

**379. Restoration of the Bourbon Dynasty.** When, in 1814, the allies placed on the throne the brother of Louis XVI, a veteran *émigré*, who had openly denounced the Revolution and had been intriguing with other European powers for nearly twenty years to gain the French crown, there was no organized opposition to the new king. There had never been a majority in France in favor of a republic. The doctrines of the Jacobins had been held by no more than a vigorous minority. The French still preferred to have a king.

There was, however, no danger that Louis XVIII would undo the great work of the Revolution and of Napoleon. He was no fanatic like his younger brother, the count of Artois. In his youth he had delighted in Voltaire and the writings of the philosophers. His sixty years, his corpulence, his gout, and a saving sense of humor prevented him from undertaking any wild schemes for restoring the old régime which might be suggested to him by the emigrant nobles, who now returned to France in great numbers.

**380. The Constitutional Charter.** The Constitutional Charter which he issued in June, 1814, was indeed a much more liberal form of government than that which Napoleon had permitted the French to enjoy and suggested in some ways the English constitution. There was to be a parliament consisting of two chambers—a house of peers chosen by the king, and a chamber of deputies elected by the wealthier citizens. The king alone could propose laws, but the chambers could petition the sovereign to lay before them any measure which they thought desirable.

381. Some of the "Rights of Man" guaranteed by the Charter. In addition to establishing representative government the Charter guaranteed almost all the great principles of reform laid down in the first Declaration of the Rights of Man (§§ 219-220). It proclaimed that all men were equal before the law and equally eligible to offices in the government and the army; taxation was to be apportioned according to the wealth of each citizen; personal and religious liberty was assured, although the Roman Catholic faith was to be the religion of the State; freedom of the press was guaranteed, but subject to such laws as might be passed for the purpose of checking the abuses of that freedom.

382. French Political Parties; the Ultra-royalists. Naturally different political parties soon appeared. The reactionary group, known as the Ultra-royalists, was composed largely of emigrant nobles and clergy, who wished to undo the work of the past twenty-five years and to restore the old régime in its entirety. They clamored for greater power for the clergy, for the restriction of the liberal press, for the king's absolute control over his ministers, and for the restoration of the property that they had lost during the Revolution. This party, though small in numbers, was composed of zealots, and with the king's brother, the count of Artois, at their head, they formed an active and influential minority.

383. The Moderate Royalists. The most valuable and effective support for the king, however, came from a more moderate group of royalists who had learned something during the last quarter of a century. They knew that the age of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette could not return, and consequently they urged the faithful observance of the Charter and sought, on the one hand, to induce the reactionary nobility and clergy to accept the results of the Revolution and, on the other hand, to reconcile the people to the restored monarchy. The two royalist parties—extreme and moderate—doubtless made up the greater portion of the nation.

384. The Liberals. A third party was composed of Liberals, who, though loyal to the king, did not believe the Charter gave as much power to the people as it should. They favored a reduction



of the amount of property which a man was required to own in order to vote, and they maintained that the king should be guided by ministers responsible to the parliament.

**385. Irreconcilables and Bonapartists.** Then there was a large group of persons who were irreconcilable enemies of the Bourbons and everything savoring of Bourbonism. Among them were the Bonapartists, soldiers of Napoleon, who remembered the glories of Austerlitz and Wagram and were angered by the prestige suddenly given to hundreds of Frenchmen who had borne arms against their country, but who now crowded around the king to receive offices, rewards, and honors. While Napoleon lived they longed for his return, and after his death in 1821 they placed their hopes upon his youthful son,<sup>1</sup> "Napoleon II," as they called him.

**386. The Republicans.** On the other hand, there were the Republicans, who detested Bonapartism no less than Bourbonism and wished to restore the republic of 1792.

## II. THE REVOLUTION OF 1830

**387. Reaction under Charles X (1824-1830).** As long as Louis XVIII lived the party loyal to him grew stronger, and at the time of his death in 1824 the restored Bourbon line seemed to have triumphed completely over its enemies. Had his brother, who succeeded him as Charles X, been equally wise, he too might have retained the throne until his death. But he frankly declared that he would rather chop wood than be king on the same terms as the king of England. During the early years of his reign the clergy and the Jesuits exercised a great deal of influence upon the policy of the government, and the nobles, who had been deprived of their lands during the Revolution, were granted a thousand million francs by way of indemnity.

**388. The July Ordinances, July 25, 1830.** Charles's policy aroused violent antagonism. But he did not heed the warnings,

<sup>1</sup> The son of Napoleon and Maria Louisa, born in 1811, to whom his father gave the title "King of Rome," was taken to Vienna after Napoleon's overthrow and given the title of "Duke of Reichstadt." He lived at his grandfather's court until his death in 1832 and is the hero of Rostand's once popular drama, *L'Aiglon* (The Eaglet).

and in July, 1830, determined upon a bold stroke. Acting under a provision of the Charter which empowered him to make regulations for the security of the realm, he and his ministers issued a series of ordinances establishing press censorship, increasing the property qualifications for voters, and confining the proposing of laws to the king. These ordinances practically destroyed the last vestiges of constitutional government and left the French people without any guaranty against despotism.

**389. Protest and Revolution.** The day following the publication of these ordinances, July 26, 1830, the Paris journalists published a protest, which became the signal for open resistance to the king. They declared that they would issue their newspapers in spite of the king, and that all citizens were freed from their allegiance by this attack on their rights.

The revolt, however, which brought about the overthrow of Charles X was the work of the fearless though small Republican party which faithfully cherished the traditions of 1792. On July 27 they began tearing up the paving stones for barricades, behind which they could defend themselves in the narrow streets against the police and soldiers.

**390. A New Candidate for the Throne: Louis Philippe.** On July 29 the entire city of Paris was in the hands of the insurgents. The king, now realizing the seriousness of the situation, opened negotiations with the members of the parliament and promised to repeal the obnoxious ordinances. It was, however, too late for concessions; a faction of wealthy bankers and business men was busily engaged in an effort to place upon the throne Louis Philippe, the son of a duke of Orleans who had supported the reformers in the early days of the first revolution and had finally been executed as a "suspect" during the Reign of Terror.

Louis Philippe had been identified with the Jacobins and had fought in the army of the Republic. He was later exiled and spent some time in England. When he returned to France after the restoration he sought popularity by professing democratic opinions, going about like a plain citizen, and sending his children to ordinary schools instead of employing private tutors. He was

therefore the candidate of those wishing to keep the monarchy but with the middle class in power instead of nobles and clergy.

**391. Louis Philippe supersedes Charles X.** Charles X abdicated in favor of his grandson, the duke of Bordeaux. He then charged Louis Philippe with the task of proclaiming the young duke as king Henry V, and fled to England. Louis Philippe neglected to execute these orders. On the contrary he began to seek the favor of the Republicans, who had already formed a provisional government in the City Hall with the aged Lafayette at its head.

Louis Philippe forced his way through the throng and won Lafayette over to his cause by fair promises. The two men then went out on a balcony and Lafayette embraced his companion before the crowd as a sign of their good understanding, while Louis Philippe waved the tricolored flag,—the banner of the Revolution,—which had not been unfurled in Paris since the last days of Napoleon. The hopes of the Republicans were now at an end, for they formed too small a party to prevent Louis Philippe's accession to the throne.<sup>1</sup>

#### <sup>1</sup> THE BOURBON KINGS








FIG. 53. LOUIS PHILIPPE RIDING THROUGH THE CROWD TO THE CITY HALL, PARIS, JULY, 1830





Louis convoked the Chamber of Deputies on August 3 and announced the abdication of Charles X, carefully omitting any allusion to the fact that the dethroned king had indicated his grandson as his successor. A few days later the French parliament passed a resolution calling Louis Philippe to the throne as "king of the French"; he accepted their invitation, declaring that "he could not resist the call of his country."

**392. The Results of the Revolution of 1830.** The parliament undertook to make the necessary changes in the Constitutional Charter which Louis XVIII had granted, and required the new king to accept it before his coronation. Freedom of the press and the responsibility of the ministers to the parliament were expressly proclaimed. Lastly, the provision establishing the Roman Catholic religion as the religion of the State was stricken out.

In reality, however, the Revolution of 1830 made few innovations. One king had been exchanged for another who professed more liberal views, but the government was no more democratic than before. The right to vote was still limited to the few wealthy taxpayers, and government by clergy and nobility had given place to government by bankers, speculators, manufacturers, and merchants. The tricolored flag of the Revolution was adopted as the national flag instead of the white banner of the Bourbons, but France was still a monarchy, and the labors of the Republicans in organizing the insurrection had gone for naught.

### III. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

**393. Belgians dissatisfied with the Dutch Government.** The Revolution of 1830 in France was the signal for an outbreak in the former Austrian Netherlands, where many grievances had developed since the Congress of Vienna had united the region with the Dutch Netherlands under the rule of William of Orange. In the first place, the inhabitants of his southern provinces were dissatisfied with William's government. He had granted a constitution to his entire kingdom on the model of the French Charter, but many people objected to his making the ministers

responsible to himself instead of to the parliament, and also to the restricted right to vote, which excluded all but the well-to-do. Although the southern provinces had over a million more inhabitants than the Dutch portion of the kingdom, they had only an equal number of representatives. Moreover, the Dutch monopolized most of the offices and conducted the government in their own interests. There were religious difficulties too. The




FIG. 54. PALACE OF JUSTICE AT BRUSSELS

Belgium was for centuries one of the busiest and most thrifty sections of Europe. Its rich industrial cities, like Brussels, Ghent, Bruges, and Antwerp, were nurseries of democracy during the Middle Ages. The sturdy self-dependence of the Belgians was shown in many wars against their own feudal rulers and neighboring monarchs. This picture shows how the great courthouse at Brussels towers over the roofs of the city. It is not a monument of the old days, however, but of the new kingdom of the nineteenth century

southern provinces were Catholic, the northern mainly Protestant. The king was a Protestant and took advantage of his position to convert Catholics to his own faith.

**394. The Kingdom of Belgium Created.** Louis Philippe had been seated on his throne only a few days when the agitation over these grievances broke out into open revolt at Brussels. The revolution spread; a provisional government was set up; and on October 4, 1830, it declared: "The province of Belgium,



· FIG. 55. THE MONUMENT TO THE REVOLUTIONISTS OF JULY, 1830,  
ON THE SITE OF THE BASTILLE





detached from Holland by force, shall constitute an independent state." The declaration was soon followed by the meeting of a congress to establish a permanent form of government. This assembly drew up a constitution based on the idea of the sovereignty of the people and decided that the head of the new government should be a king obliged by oath to observe the laws adopted by the people. The Belgians were therefore very much in the same position as the English in 1688 when they made William of Orange their king on their own terms. They finally chose as their sovereign Leopold of Coburg, and in July, 1831, he was crowned king of the new state.<sup>1</sup>X

#### IV. FORMATION OF THE GERMAN CONFEDERATION

**395. Consolidation of Germany.** The chief effects of the Napoleonic occupation of Germany were three in number. First, the consolidation of territory that followed the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France, as explained previously (§§ 287 ff.), had done away with the ecclesiastical states, the territories of the knights, and most of the free towns. Only thirty-eight German states, including four free towns, were left when the Congress of Vienna took up the question of forming a confederation to replace the defunct Holy Roman Empire.

**396. Advantageous Position of Prussia.** Secondly, the external and internal conditions of Prussia had been so changed as to open the way for it finally to replace Austria as the controlling power in Germany. A great part of the Slavic possessions seized in the last two partitions of Poland had been lost, but as an indemnity Prussia had received half of the kingdom of Saxony, in the very

<sup>1</sup> The constitution which the Belgians drew up for themselves in 1831, with some modifications, is the basis of their government to-day, and Leopold II, the son of their first king, Leopold I, was their sovereign until 1909, when he was succeeded by his nephew, King Albert.

The loss of Belgium made no important change in the government of the Netherlands. In 1848 King William II was forced to grant his subjects a new and enlightened constitution in place of the charter which he had issued some thirty years before. On the death of William III in 1890 his daughter, Wilhelmina, came to the throne, and as the grand duchy of Luxemburg was hereditary only in the male line, it passed to a relative of the deceased king, the duke of Nassau.

center of Germany, and also the Rhine provinces on the west, where the people were thoroughly imbued with the revolutionary doctrines that had prevailed in France. Prussia now embraced all the various types of people included in the German nation and was comparatively free from the presence of non-German races. In this respect it offered a marked contrast to the heterogeneous and mongrel population of its great rival, Austria.

The internal changes in Prussia were equally great. The reforms carried out after the battle of Jena had done for Prussia somewhat the same service that the first National Assembly had done for France. The abolition of the feudal social castes and the liberation of the serfs made the economic development of the country possible. The reorganization of the whole military system prepared the way for Prussia's victories in 1866 and 1870, which led to the formation of a German Empire under her headship.

**397. Demand for Constitutional Government.** Thirdly, the agitations of the Napoleonic Period had aroused the national spirit. The king's appeal to the people to aid in freeing their country from foreign oppression (§ 341), and the idea of their participation in a government based upon a written constitution, had produced widespread discontent with the old absolute monarchy.

**398. The German Confederation of 1815.** When the form of union for the German states came up for discussion at the Congress of Vienna, the jealousy of Austria and Prussia prevented the establishment of a firm national constitution. The confederation finally agreed upon was not a union of the various *countries* involved, but of "The Sovereign Princes and Free Towns of Germany," including the emperor of Austria and the king of Prussia for such of their possessions as were formerly included in the Holy Roman Empire; the king of Denmark for Holstein; and the king of the Netherlands for the grand duchy of Luxemburg. The union thus included two sovereigns who were out-and-out foreigners and, on the other hand, did not include all the possessions of its two most important members.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Observe the boundary of the German Confederation as indicated on the map, p. 198.

**399. The Weakness of the German Confederation.** The assembly of the confederation was a diet which met at Frankfurt. It was composed (as was perfectly logical) not of representatives of the *people*, but of plenipotentiaries of the *rulers* who were members of the confederation. The diet had very slight powers, for it could not interfere in the domestic affairs of the states, and the delegates who composed it could not vote as they pleased, since they had to obey the instructions of the rulers who appointed them and refer all important questions to their respective sovereigns. So powerless and so slow was this assembly that it became the laughingstock of Europe.

The members of the confederation reserved to themselves the right of forming alliances of all kinds, but pledged themselves to make no agreement threatening the safety of the union or of any of its members, and not to make war upon any member of the confederation on any pretense whatsoever. The constitution could not be amended without the approval of *all* the governments concerned. In spite of its obvious weaknesses the confederation of 1815 lasted for half a century, until Prussia finally (in 1866) expelled Austria from the union by arms and began the formation of the later German Empire.

**400. Liberal Protests Suppressed.** The liberal and progressive party in Germany was much disappointed by the failure of the Congress of Vienna to weld Germany into a really national state. The university students denounced the reactionary party in their meetings and drank to the freedom of Germany. On October 18, 1817, they held a celebration in the Wartburg to commemorate both Luther's revolt (Vol. I, § 736) and the anniversary of the battle of Leipzig. Speeches were made in honor of the brave who had fallen in the war against Napoleon.

This innocent burst of enthusiasm excited great anxiety in the minds of the conservative statesmen of Europe, of whom Metternich was, of course, the leader. The murder by a fanatical student of a newspaper man, Kotzebue, who was supposed to have influenced the Tsar to desert his former liberal policy, cast further discredit upon the liberal party. It also gave Metternich



an opportunity to emphasize the terrible results which he anticipated would come from the students' associations, liberal governments, and the freedom of the press.

401. The "Carlsbad Resolutions" (1819). Metternich called together the representatives of the larger states of the confederation at Carlsbad in August, 1819. Here a series of resolutions were drawn up with the aim of checking the free expression of opinions in newspapers and universities hostile to existing institutions and




FIG. 56. THE PALACE OF THE FORMER EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA

Under the influence of Metternich, Vienna became almost as much the center of European politics after Waterloo as Paris had been under Napoleon

of discovering and bringing to justice the revolutionists, who were supposed to exist in dangerous numbers. These "Carlsbad Resolutions" were laid before the diet of the confederation by Austria and adopted, though not without protest.

The attack upon the freedom of the press, and especially the interference with the liberty of teaching in the great institutions of learning, which were already beginning to pride themselves on their scholarship and science, scandalized some of the progressive spirits in Germany; yet no successful protest was raised, and Germany as a whole acquiesced for a generation in Metternich's system of discouraging reform of all kinds.

**402. Signs of Progress in Germany.** Nevertheless, important progress was made in southern Germany. As early as 1818 the king of Bavaria granted his people a constitution in which he stated their rights and admitted them to a share in the government by establishing a parliament. His example was followed within two years by the rulers of Baden, Würtemberg, and Hesse. Another change was the gradual formation of a customs union, which permitted goods to be sent freely from one German state to another without the payment of duties at each boundary line. This yielded some of the advantages of a political union. This economic confederation, of which Prussia was the head and from which Austria was excluded, was a harbinger of the future German Empire (see Chapter XVI, below).

## V. RESTORATION IN SPAIN AND ITALY

**403. Reaction under Ferdinand VII.** The restoration in Spain after Napoleon's downfall was more thoroughgoing than in any other country involved in the revolutionary conflicts. When Ferdinand VII (who had spent the previous six years in France surrounded by Napoleon's guards) was, in 1814, restored to power by the strength of English arms, he repudiated all vestiges of Napoleon's reforms. He declared that the Cortes which had drawn up a constitution in 1812 had usurped his rights by imposing on his people "an anarchical and seditious constitution based on the democratic principles of the French Revolution." He accordingly annulled it and proclaimed those who continued to support it guilty of high treason and worthy of death. With the old absolute government he restored the Inquisition, feudal privileges, and the religious orders. The Jesuits returned, the books and newspapers were strictly censored, free speech was repressed, monastic property was returned to the former owners, and the liberals were imprisoned in large numbers or executed.

**404. Italy only "a Geographical Expression" after 1815.** Turning to Italy, we find that the Congress of Vienna had left it, as Metternich observed, merely "a geographical expression"; it

had no political unity whatever. Lombardy and Venetia, in the northern part, were in the hands of Austria, while Parma, Modena, and Tuscany belonged to members of the Austrian family. In the south the considerable kingdom of Naples was ruled over by a branch of the Spanish Bourbons. In the center, cutting the peninsula in twain, were the Papal States, which extended north to the Po. The presence of Austria and the apparent impossibility of inducing the Pope to submit to any government but his own seemed to banish for the time being all hope of making Italy into a true nation.

**405. French Reforms Abolished.** Although Napoleon had governed Italy despotically, he had introduced many important reforms. The vestiges of the feudal régime had vanished at his approach; he had established an orderly administration and had forwarded public improvements. But his unscrupulous use of Italy to advance his personal ambitions disappointed those who at first had received him with enthusiasm and they came to look eagerly for his downfall.

The king of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel I, entered his capital of Turin on May 20, 1814, amid great rejoicing, but immediately proceeded to destroy with a stroke of his pen all the reforms which the Revolution had accomplished in Piedmont during his absence. He gave back to the nobility their ancient feudal rights; he restored to the clergy their property, their courts, and their press censorship; religious freedom was suppressed.

The same policy was adopted in the States of the Church, where, in 1814, an edict was issued which swept away French legislation and restored the old order. In the zeal to destroy the work of the French, root and branch, vaccination and street lighting in Rome were abolished as revolutionary innovations.

**406. Austrian Possessions in Italy.** In Lombardy and Venetia, where Austrian sovereignty was established, the reforms instituted during the Napoleonic Period were practically abolished. In order to fasten securely their government on these provinces, the Austrians set up a secret police system, which constantly interfered with individual liberty in the most arbitrary fashion.

In addition to his Lombardo-Venetian kingdom in the northern part of Italy, the Austrian emperor enjoyed a protectorate over Modena; by treaty the duke of Tuscany practically surrendered his duchy to him; Maria Louisa of Parma turned the administration of her domain over to his officers; and Ferdinand of Naples was bound to him in a defensive and offensive alliance. In short, only Sardinia and the Papal States retained their freedom from "German" domination.

**407. The Work of the French not entirely Undone.** Though dismembered and subjected to a foreign yoke, the Italy of 1815 was not the Italy which Napoleon had found when he first entered it at the head of the French army in 1796. Despite the restoration, traces of the Revolution were everywhere apparent, not only in law and government but, above all, in the minds of men. National aspirations had been awakened which the Austrian police could not stamp out; Italians, high and low, came to know and appreciate French reforms at first hand, though they might loathe the memory of Napoleon as a conqueror and a tyrant.

## VI. THE SPANISH-AMERICAN COLONIES AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1820

**408. Spain's American Colonies.** The very thoroughness with which Metternich's ideas were carried out in Spain and Italy led to renewed attempts on the part of the liberals to abolish despotism. It was not, therefore, in Germany or France, as the allies had feared, but in Spain, and then in Italy, that the spirit of revolution was first to reawaken.

Spain itself was, of course, but a small part of the vast Spanish empire, which included Mexico (and the regions to the northwest later acquired by the United States), Central America, and large portions of South America, besides her island possessions. The Spanish colonies had from the first been the victims of the selfish commercial policy of the mother country, which forced them to carry on all their trade with one or two favored Spanish ports. The success of the American Revolution by which the North



American colonies threw off the yoke of England suggested ideas of independence to the Spanish colonies. These suddenly broke out into revolt when the news reached the colonies that Napoleon had placed his brother on the Spanish throne (§ 327) and proposed to control the Spanish commerce in his own interests.




FIG. 57. BOLIVAR

**409. Revolt of the Spanish Colonies (1810-1825).** Beginning in 1810 the colonies of Mexico, New Granada (now called Colombia), Venezuela, Peru, Buenos Aires, and Chile, while they still professed to be loyal to Ferdinand VII, took their government into their own hands; they drove out the former


Spanish agents, and finally rejected Spanish rule altogether. At first the revolts were put down with great cruelty, but in 1817, under the leadership of Bolívar, Venezuela won its independence, and during the following five years the Spaniards lost New Granada, Peru, Ecuador, Chile, Mexico, and lastly (1825) Upper Peru, which was renamed Bolívar after its liberator.

**410. England opposes Reconquest of the Spanish Colonies.** Ever since his restoration Ferdinand VII had been sending thousands of men to die of fever and wounds in the vain attempt to subdue the insurgents. He had called upon the other powers to help him, on the ground that his colonies were guilty of revolutionary crimes which it was to the interest of all the allied monarchs to aid in suppressing. He was disappointed, however.



### SOUTH AMERICA

Scale of statute miles



- ★ Capitals of independent countries
- Capitals of European colonies
- +++++ Principal railroads

90° Longitude West 80° 70° 60° 50° 40° 30°



England did not wish to lose the trade which had grown up with South American ports since they had been freed from the restrictions of the mother country.

**411. Revolution in Spain (1820).** At last, in January, 1820, the soldiers who were waiting in Cadiz to be sent to America, well aware of the sufferings of the regiments which had preceded them, were easily aroused to revolt by two adventurous officers. The revolutionists proclaimed the restoration of the constitution of 1812, which Ferdinand had abolished on his return. Their call was answered by the Liberals in the larger towns, including Madrid, where a mob surrounded the palace (March 9) and forced the king to take the oath to the constitution of 1812.

**412. Revolution in Italy: the Carbonari.** News of the Spanish revolt spread quickly throughout Italy, where the spirit of insurrection had been at work among the secret societies which had everywhere been organized. By far the most noted of these was that which called itself the Carbonari; that is, charcoal burners. Its objects were constitutional government and national independence and unity. When the Neapolitans heard that the king of Spain had been forced by an insurrection to accept a constitution, they made the first attempt on the part of the Italian people to gain constitutional liberty by compelling their king (July, 1820) to agree to accept this same Spanish constitution of 1812. The king, however, at once began to cast about for foreign assistance to suppress the revolution and enable him to return to his former ways.

**413. Metternich's Measures to suppress Revolution.** He had not long to wait. The alert Metternich invited Russia, Prussia, France, and England to unite, in order to check the development of "revolt and crime." "Revolution" appeared to him and his sympathizers as a fearful disease that not only destroyed those whom it attacked directly but spread contagion wherever it appeared. Therefore prompt and severe measures of quarantine were justified, in view of the necessity of stamping out the devastating plague.

**414. Austrian Intervention in Italy.** A conference was called at the Austrian town of Laibach in January, 1821, for the purpose of taking practical measures to restore absolutism in southern



Italy. To this conference King Ferdinand of Naples was summoned, and once safely away from the reformers, he heartily concurred in the plan to send an Austrian army to Naples to abolish the noxious constitution. The leaders of the revolt were executed, imprisoned, or exiled, and the king was freed from the restraints of the constitution. ✓

**415. Interference of France in Spain.** Meanwhile the revolution in Spain had developed into a civil war, and the representatives of the great powers—Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, and England—met at Verona in 1822 to discuss their common interests and decide what should be done about the Spanish crisis. England refused to interfere in any way; so finally it was left to Louis XVIII, urged on by the clerical and ultra-royalist party, to send an army across the Pyrenees “with the purpose of maintaining a descendant of Henry IV on the throne of Spain.” This interference in the affairs of a neighboring nation which was struggling for constitutional government disgusted the French Liberals, who saw that France, in intervening in favor of Ferdinand VII, was doing just what Prussia and Austria had attempted in 1792 in the interests of Louis XVI. The French commander easily defeated the revolutionists and placed Ferdinand in a position to stamp out his enemies. He did this in such a ferocious and blood-thirsty manner that his French allies were heartily ashamed of him.

**416. European Policies and the Monroe Doctrine.** While France was helping to restore absolutism in Spain the Spanish colonies, as we have seen, were rapidly winning their independence, encouraged by the United States and England. At the Congress of Verona all the powers except England were anxious to discuss a plan by which they might aid Spain to get the better of her rebellious colonies, since it was the fixed purpose of the allies to suppress “rebellion in whatever place and under whatever form it might show itself.”

The threats of Metternich and his friends led President Monroe, in his message to Congress, December, 1823, to call attention to the dangers of intervention as practiced by the European alliance of great powers, and clearly state what has since become

famous as the "Monroe Doctrine"—namely, that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of the European allies to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and as an unfriendly act.

**417. England recognizes Independence of Spanish Colonies.** About the same time the English foreign secretary Canning informed the French ambassador in London that any attempt to bring the Spanish colonies again under their former subjection to Spain would prove unsuccessful, and that while England would remain neutral in the troubles between the mother country and her American dominions, it would not tolerate the intervention of a third party. Toward the close of 1824 England recognized the independence of Buenos Aires, Mexico, and Colombia, and paid no heed to the remonstrance of the continental powers that such an action "tended to encourage the revolutionary spirit which it had been found so difficult to restrain in Europe."

**418. Portugal.** A word may be said here of Spain's little neighbor Portugal. It will be remembered that when Napoleon dispatched his troops thither in 1807 the royal family fled across the Atlantic to their colony of Brazil. After the expulsion of the French by the English, the government was placed in the hands of an English general, Beresford, who ruled so despotically that he stirred up a revolt in 1820, at the time when the insurrection in Spain was in progress. The insurgents demanded the return of the royal family from Brazil and the granting of a constitution. The king, John VI, accordingly set sail for Portugal, leaving his elder son, Pedro, to represent him in Brazil.<sup>1</sup>

**419. Failure of Metternich's System.** It will have become apparent that Metternich's international police system, designed to prevent innovation and revolution, was for all practical purposes a failure. The action of Great Britain and the United States had weakened it. The struggle of the Greek revolutionists against

<sup>1</sup> In 1822 Pedro proclaimed the independence of Brazil and took the title of emperor. In 1831 he abdicated in favor of his son, who retained the crown until he was deposed by the revolution of 1889, which established the United States of Brazil as a republic.

Turkey for independence, which finally involved Russia in a war with the Sultan and ended in victory for the Greeks (§ 772 below), demonstrated that even Russia would not hesitate to aid and abet revolution if she could thereby advance her own interests. The climax was reached in 1830 by the revolution in France described above, which deposed the older Bourbon line and established a liberal government, thus violating the principles for which Metternich had fought with so much determination. In fact, the Quadruple Alliance (§ 369), as such, never accomplished any great work, and it went to pieces as much through its own inherent weakness as through the growth of revolutionary spirit.

### QUESTIONS

I. Account for the fact that the French people did not oppose the restoration of 1814. Describe the Constitutional Charter granted to France, June, 1814. Account for the origin of political parties in France. State the principles for which each stood.

II. Contrast the political views of Charles X with those of his brother Louis XVIII. What were the July ordinances? Describe the way in which Louis Philippe secured the title of king. Give the terms of the revised Charter. What gains were made by the Revolution of 1830?

III. State the objections of the Belgians to the Dutch government. Describe the government established in the new kingdom of Belgium.

IV. What were the most important results of Napoleon's influence in Germany? Describe the plan adopted in the German Confederation of 1815. Point out the weaknesses of this union. What were the "Carlsbad Resolutions"? Mention two important changes in the government of the German states during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

V. What was the situation in Spain after the restoration of Ferdinand VII? Draw a map showing the territory held by Austria in Italy. What was the kingdom of Sardinia?

VI. Describe the revolt of the Spanish-American colonies. In what way did Spain regain the constitution of 1812? What was the effect of the Spanish revolt upon the people of Italy? How were the revolutionary movements in Italy repressed?

Who was Bolivar? What is the Monroe Doctrine? When and why was it first stated? Give a brief outline of the history of Portugal from 1807 to the restoration of the old line of monarchs.

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) reaction and revolution in France, pp. 1-14; (2) Germany and reaction after 1814, pp. 16-22; (3) reactionary Europe and the Monroe Doctrine, pp. 30-44.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Belgium, France, Germany, England, Louis Philippe, Metternich, Simon Bolivar, and Monroe Doctrine.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the revival of revolutionary movements in 1830, pp. 46-57; (2) Spanish affairs and the Monroe Doctrine, pp. 20-26. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (3) restoration and reaction, pp. 17-24.



## CHAPTER XII

### THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

#### I. INVENTION OF MACHINERY FOR SPINNING AND WEAVING

**420. Mechanical Inventions revolutionize Industry.** In the preceding chapters we have reviewed the startling changes and reforms introduced by the leaders of the French Revolution and by Napoleon Bonaparte, and the reconstruction of Europe at the Congress of Vienna. These were mainly the work of statesmen, warriors, and diplomats—who have certainly done their part in making Europe what it is to-day. But a still more fundamental revolution than that which has been described had begun in England before the meeting of the Estates General.

The chief actors in this never stirred an assembly by their fiery denunciation of evils, or led an army to victory, or conducted a clever diplomatic negotiation. On the contrary, their attention was concentrated upon the homely operations of everyday life—the housewife drawing out her thread with a distaff or spinning wheel, the slow work of the weaver at his primitive loom, the miner struggling against the water which threatened to flood his mine. They busied themselves perseveringly with wheels, cylinders, bands, and rollers, patiently combining and recombining them, until, after many discouragements, they made discoveries destined to alter the habits, ideas, and prospects of the great mass of the people far more profoundly than all the edicts of the National Assembly and all the conquests of Napoleon taken together.

**421. Few Inventions added to the Old Stock before 1750; the Industrial Revolution.** The Greeks and Romans, notwithstanding their refined civilization, had, as has been pointed out, shown slight aptitude for mechanical invention, and little had been added to their stock of human appliances before the middle

of the eighteenth century. Up to that time the people of western Europe for the most part continued to till their fields, weave their cloth, and saw and plane their boards by hand, much as the ancient Egyptians had done. Merchandise was still transported in slow, lumbering carts, and letters were as long in passing from London to Rome as in the reign of Constantine. Could a peasant, a smith, or a weaver of the age of Cæsar Augustus have visited France or England eighteen hundred years later, he would have recognized the familiar flail, forge, distaff, and hand loom of his own day.

Suddenly, however, a series of ingenious devices were invented, which in a few generations eclipsed the achievements of ages and revolutionized every branch of business. This *Industrial Revolution* serves to explain the world in which we live, with its busy cities, its gigantic factories filled with complicated machinery, its commerce and vast fortunes, its trade-

unions and labor parties, its bewildering variety of plans for bettering the lot of the great mass of the people. This story of discovery and invention is in no way inferior in importance to the more familiar history of kings, parliaments, wars, treaties, and constitutions.

**422. Improvements in Methods of Spinning.** The revolution in manufacture which has taken place in the last hundred and fifty years can be illustrated by the improvement in making cloth, which is so necessary to our comfort and welfare. In order to produce cloth one must first *spin* (that is, twist) the wool, cotton, or flax into thread; then by means of a loom the thread can be *woven* into a fabric. A simple way of spinning thread was discovered thousands of years ago, but it was possible by the old methods



FIG. 58. DISTAFF AND SPINDLE

for a person to make only a single thread at a time.<sup>1</sup> By 1767 James Hargreaves, an English spinner, invented what was called a spinning jenny, which enabled a single workman, by turning a wheel, to spin eight or ten threads at once and thus do the work of eight or ten spinners. A year later a barber, Richard Arkwright,<sup>2</sup> patented a device for drawing out thread by means of rollers, and




FIG. 59. THE FIRST SPINNING JENNY

made a large fortune—for his time—by establishing a great factory filled with power-driven machines. In 1779 Samuel Crompton made a happy combination of Hargreaves's spinning jenny and Arkwright's roller machine, which was called the mule. Before the end of the eighteenth century machines spinning two hundred threads simultaneously had been invented, and as they were driven by power and required only one or two watchers, the hand workers could by no means compete with them. Such inventions as these produced the modern factory system.

**423. Improvements in Weaving; the Cotton Gin.** The enormous output of thread and yarn on these new machines made the weavers dissatisfied with the clumsy old hand loom, which had been little changed since ancient times until the eighteenth century.

<sup>1</sup> The hand spinner had bunches of wool, which had been combed into loose curls, on the end of a stick, or distaff. She pulled and twisted this with her fingers into a yarn, which she wound on the spindle (see Fig. 58). By whirling the spindle around she could help the twisting process. The spinning wheel was invented to give a better twist to the spindle. It was still used by our great-grandmothers, and had first become common in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By means of the spinning wheel it was possible in some cases for one person to make two threads, one in one hand and the other in the other.

<sup>2</sup> See portrait opposite page 240 below. Arkwright is often spoken of as the founder of the factory system. He was not only an inventor but also a clever business man, and knew how to make large profits from the machines he set up.



At length, in 1738, John Kay invented a fly shuttle, a contrivance by which the weaver, without any assistant, could drive the shuttle to and fro by means of a handle placed conveniently near his stool. This improved hand loom was in use during the entire eighteenth century, although in 1784 Dr. Cartwright, a clergyman of Kent, patented a new loom, which automatically threw the shuttle and




FIG. 60. SPINNING MULE

It is impossible here to explain the mechanism of a modern spinning mule. But it will be apparent that with one attendant hundreds of threads are being drawn out as the machine operates. The student should visit a spinning mill and see the process for himself

shifted the warp. Cartwright's self-acting loom, however, did not supplant the hand loom for almost fifty years, when its mechanism was so perfected that the hand workers could no longer compete with it. It was steadily improved during the nineteenth century, until now a single machine watched by one workman can do as much weaving in a day as two hundred weavers could do with old-fashioned hand looms. Other inventions followed. The time required for bleaching was reduced from several months to a few days by the use of acids instead of relying principally upon sunlight. In 1792 Eli Whitney, in the United States, invented a power "gin," which enabled one man to take the



seeds out of over a thousand pounds of cotton a day instead of five or six pounds, which had been the limit for the hand worker.

**424. Mass Production.** The effect of these inventions in increasing the amount of cloth manufactured was astonishing. In 1764 England imported only about four million pounds of raw




FIG. 61. NEWCOMEN'S STEAM ENGINE

Newcomen's steam engines were run by condensing the steam in the cylinder (*a*) by cold water (*g*), so that the air on the piston (*s*) pressed it down in the vacuum. Watt covered both ends of the cylinder and used steam instead of air to push the piston

cotton, but by 1841 she was using nearly five hundred million pounds annually. At the close of the Napoleonic wars Robert Owen, a distinguished manufacturer and philanthropist (§ 445), declared that his two thousand workmen at New Lanark could do as much work with the new machinery which had been invented during the past forty years as all the operators of Scotland could do without it.

## II. THE STEAM ENGINE

**425. The Significance of Iron and Power.** In order that inventions might further develop and become widely

useful, two things were necessary: In the first place, there must be available a sufficiently strong material out of which to construct the machinery, and for this purpose iron and steel have, with few exceptions, proved the most satisfactory. In the second place, some adequate power had to be found to propel the machinery, which is ordinarily too heavy to be run by hand or foot. Of course windmills were common, and waterfalls and running streams had long been used to turn water wheels, but these forces were too restricted and uncertain to suffice for the rapid development of

machinery which resulted from the beginnings we have described. Consequently, while Arkwright, Hargreaves, and Crompton were successfully solving the problem of new methods of spinning and weaving, other inventors were improving the ways of melting and forging iron for the machines and of using steam to run them.

Although iron had been used for tools, weapons, and armor for hundreds of years, the processes of reducing the iron from the ore and of working it up were very crude. It was not until 1750 that coal began to be used instead of charcoal for melting, or softening, the metal. The old-fashioned bellows gave way to new methods of producing the blast necessary for melting iron, and steam hammers were invented to pound out the iron instead of its being done by hand.

**426. James Watt and the Steam Engine.** Contrary to popular impression, James Watt did not invent the steam engine.

Important parts of the engine—the boiler, the cylinder, and the piston—had been invented before he was born, and crude engines had been employed for a long time in pumping water. Indeed, Watt's interest in the steam engine seems to have been awakened first during the winter of 1763-1764. He was an instrument maker in Glasgow, and was called upon to repair the model of a steam engine which had been invented sixty years before by an ingenious




FIG. 62. JAMES WATT

Watt was enabled to make his invention a success by securing the financial support of a rich iron manufacturer of Birmingham. The firm of Boulton and Watt soon supplied most of the engines for the whole country. The first use to which engines were put was to pump out mines

mechanic named Newcomen. Watt, however, was a brilliant and industrious experimenter, and, building upon the work of Newcomen and other men, he was able to make the steam engine a practical machine for furnishing power to the new factories. In 1785 the steam engine was first applied to run spinning machinery in a factory at Nottinghamshire. Arkwright, spoken of above, adopted it in 1790, and by the end of the century steam engines were becoming as common as windmills and water mills.

**427. The Industrial Revolution in France.** England was the first country to develop the modern use of machinery for manufacturing. A large part of her great rôle in the modern world is to be attributed to the fact that she got the start of all other nations in building factories and producing commodities in vast quantities for export. It was not until after the establishment of peace in 1815 that the Industrial Revolution really began in France. Napoleon endeavored to foster and protect French industries and stimulate the employment of machinery in manufacturing, but in spite of his best efforts French industry remained in a backward state. On the eve of his downfall there was only one small steam engine employed in French industry—at a cotton factory in Alsace; but by 1847 France had nearly five thousand steam engines, with a capacity of sixty thousand horse power. Germany was also much behind England.

The consumption of raw cotton was multiplied fivefold in thirty years, and in 1847 there were over one hundred thousand spinning machines with three and a half million spindles at work. By 1848 France had many important manufacturing centers. Paris alone had three hundred and forty-two thousand factory hands, and other cities, such as Lyon, Marseille, Lille, Bordeaux, and Toulouse, had their great factories, and whole quarters peopled by factory laborers. And the working class had begun by that time to form unions and organize strikes against their employers for the purpose of increasing wages and reducing the hours of labor. The importance of the Industrial Revolution in its influence on political issues and campaigns will become apparent as we proceed.

## III. CAPITALISM AND THE FACTORY SYSTEM

428. The "Domestic System" of Industry. Having seen how machinery was introduced into England in the latter part of the eighteenth century and how steam came to be utilized as a motive power, we have now to consider the important results of these inventions in changing the conditions under which people lived and worked. Up to this time the term "manufacture" still meant, as it did in the original Latin (*manu facere*), "to make by hand." Artisans carried on trades with their own tools in their own homes or in small shops, as the cobbler does to-day. Instead of working with hundreds of others in great factories and being entirely dependent upon his wages, the artisan, in England at least, was often able to give some attention to a small garden plot, from which he derived a part of his support.

429. The Factory System. As the Industrial Revolution progressed, these hand workers found themselves unable to compete with the swift and tireless machines. Manufacturing on a small scale with the simple old tools and appliances became increasingly unprofitable. The workers had to leave their cottages and spend their days in great factories established by capitalists who had enough money to erect the huge buildings and install in them the elaborate and costly machinery and the engines to run it.

430. Results of Division of Labor. One of the principal results of this factory system is that it makes possible a minute division of labor. Instead of working at the whole process, each worker concentrates his attention upon a single stage of it, and by repeating a simple set of motions over and over again acquires wonderful dexterity. At the same time the apprenticeship is shortened, because each separate task is comparatively simple. Moreover the invention of new machinery is increased, because the very subdivision of the process into simple steps often suggests some way of substituting mechanical action for that of the human hand.

An example of the greatly increased output rendered possible by the use of machinery and the division of labor is given by the distinguished Scotch economist, Adam Smith, whose great work,



*The Wealth of Nations*, appeared in 1776. Speaking of the manufacture of a pin in his own time, Adam Smith says: "To make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pin is another. It is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper, and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations." By this division, he adds, ten persons could make upwards of forty-eight thousand pins in a day. This was when machinery was in its infancy. A recent writer reports that an English machine now makes one hundred and eighty pins a minute, cutting the wire, flattening the heads, sharpening the points, and dropping the pins into their proper places. In a single factory which he visited seven million pins were made in a day, and three men were all that were required to manage the mechanism.

**431. The Growth of Manufacturing Towns.** Before the coming of machinery, industry was not concentrated in a few great cities, but was scattered more or less evenly over the country in the hands of small masters, or independent workmen, who combined manufacturing with agriculture on a small scale. For example, the metal workers of West Bromwich and the cutlers of Sheffield (already famous in Chaucer's day) lived in cottages with small plots of land around them, and in dull seasons, or to change their occupation, engaged in gardening. The factory system put an end to all this. The workmen now had to live near their work; long rows of houses, without gardens or even grassplots, were hastily built around the factory buildings, and thus the ugly tenement districts of our cities came into existence.

**432. The Rise of the Capitalist Class.** This great revolution in the methods of manufacturing produced also a sharp distinction between two classes of men involved. There were, on the one hand, the capitalists who owned the buildings and all the equipment, and, on the other, the workmen whom they hired to operate the machines. Previous to the eighteenth century those who owned large estates had been, on the whole, the most important class in political and social life. But alongside of the landed

aristocracy a powerful business class had arisen, whose wealth, gained by commerce and trade, gave them influence in the affairs of the nation. With the improvements in machinery there was added the new class of modern capitalists, who amassed fortunes by establishing great manufacturing industries.<sup>1</sup>

**433. The Modern Workingman.** The workingman necessarily became dependent upon the few who were rich enough to set up factories. He could no longer earn a livelihood in the old way by conducting a small shop to suit himself. The capitalist owned and controlled the necessary machinery, and so long as there were plenty of workmen seeking employment in order to earn their daily bread, the owner could fix a low wage and long hours. The question of the proportion of the product which should go to the workers and that which may properly be taken by the capitalist, or manager, who makes a successful business possible, lies at the basis of the great problem of capital and labor.

**434. The Labor of Women and Children.** The destruction of the domestic system of industry had also a revolutionary effect upon the work and the lives of women and children. In all except the heaviest of the mechanical industries, such as ironworking or shipbuilding, the introduction of modern machines tended greatly to increase the number of women and children employed compared with the men. For example, in the textile industry in England during the fifty years from 1841 to 1891 the number of males employed increased 53 per cent and the number of females 221 per cent. Before the invention of the steam engine, when the simple machines had to be run by hand, children could be employed only in some of the minor processes, such as preparing the cotton for spinning. But in the modern factory, labor is largely confined to watching machines, piecing broken threads, and working levers, so that both women and children can be utilized as effectively as men, and much more cheaply.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The industrial capitalist began to appear even before the days of Arkwright and Watt, for there were employers earlier who in some cases collected ten, twenty, or more looms in a town and employed workmen who had no tools of their own, thus creating something like the later factory system.

**435. The Industrial Revolution** relieves some **Women of Former Duties**. Doubtless the women were by no means idle under the old system of domestic industry, but their tasks were varied and performed at home, whereas under the new system they must flock to the factory at the call of the whistle and labor monotonously at a speed set by the foreman. This led to many grave evils which, as we shall see (§§ 648 ff. below), the State has been called upon to remedy by factory legislation, which has served to save the women and children from some of the worst hardships, although a great deal still remains to be done. On the other hand, thousands of women belonging to the well-to-do classes have been relieved of many of the duties which devolved upon the housewife in the eighteenth century, when many things were made at home which can now be better and more cheaply produced on a large scale.

#### IV. EFFECTS OF THE NEW BUSINESS METHODS

**436. The Progressive Spirit.** Before the Industrial Revolution there had been no sudden change in the life and habits of the people, since the same tools had been used in the same way, often by the same family, from generation to generation. When invention began, change began, and it seems likely to become more and more rapid, since new and better ways of doing things are discovered daily. Old methods give way to new ones, and the workman of to-day may successively engage in a considerable variety of occupations during his life as industries rise, are transformed, and decline under the stress of competition and invention. This serves to shake the workingman out of the old routine, encourages him to move from place to place as circumstances dictate, and so widens his experience and broadens his mind. He has also learned to combine with his fellows into national unions; and even international congresses of workingmen are held to consider their common interests and agree upon general policies.

**437. The Expansion of Commerce.** To these changes still another may be added; that is, the expansion of commerce. In





FIG. 63. RICHARD ARKWRIGHT

Arkwright was one of the first men to acquire wealth from the use of machinery in the factories, and so is sometimes termed the father of the Factory System





spite of the development of trade before the eighteenth century, a great part of the goods produced was destined to be consumed in the neighborhood, whereas after the invention of machinery it became customary to manufacture goods to be sold in any part of the world; so that one would find the products of Manchester or Birmingham in Hongkong, Melbourne, or Bulawayo. According to official estimates, the exports of England, which amounted to less than fourteen million pounds sterling in 1783, exceeded twenty-nine millions thirteen years later.

**438. New Theories about Government.** The Industrial Revolution, in addition to changing fundamentally the old methods of living, traveling, and working, gave an entirely new direction to European politics and to theories of government and industry. The two great classes created by the Industrial Revolution, namely, the middle class and the working class, each entered politics on its own account; and the struggle of these two groups against the large landlords and the clergy constitutes a very large portion of the political history of Europe during the nineteenth century. The contest of the manufacturers of Europe to win markets for their products in the four corners of the earth is largely responsible for the opening up of backward places in the Orient and Africa.

**439. The Theory of Individualism.** The enterprising factory owners and merchants handling products were naturally discontented with the way in which feudal landlords and absolute monarchs monopolized, or attempted to monopolize, government. They were also dissatisfied with the attempts of governments to maintain many of the restrictions on industry and business enterprise which originated in the Middle Ages, and which only hampered the individual initiative of the man who wanted to run his business in his own way and sell his goods as he pleased.

**440. Political Economy of the Business Class.** This middle class of manufacturers and traders developed a theory of government suited to their particular interests, which they called Political Economy. According to this theory of government or political economy, which was formulated by Adam Smith and developed by

{ later writers, the government should keep its hands off of industry. It should not attempt to regulate prices of goods or pass upon their quality. Neither should it interfere with the employer and his workmen nor prescribe the hours or conditions of labor in factories.<sup>1</sup>

The principle on which this early political economy was based was that every person was the best judge of what was good for himself, and, if left alone, would rise or fall in the scale of prosperity according to his individual efforts and abilities. Prices would be kept at the lowest possible point by competition among manufacturers, and a "natural" rate of wages would be established in each industry under the law of supply and demand. This theory was peculiarly acceptable to the prosperous middle class of merchants and manufacturers, and they assumed that their doctrines were not only sound and productive of the greatest happiness but partook of the character of "natural laws" which could not be broken by governments or by organizations of workingmen without disastrous consequences.

#### 441. Evils of the Factory System: the Question of Reform.

The chief trouble with this political economy was that it did not work well in practice. On the contrary, the great manufacturing cities, instead of being filled with happy and prosperous people, became the homes of a small number of capitalists, who had grown rich as the owners and directors of the factories, and multitudes of poor working people with no other resources than their wages, which were often not enough to keep their families from starvation. Little children under nine years of age, working from twelve to fifteen hours a day, and women, forced to leave their homes to tend the machines in the factories, were now replacing the men workers. After their long day's work they returned to miserable tenements, in which they were forced to live.

After the close of the Napoleonic wars, as things got worse rather than better, there were increasing signs of discontent in England. This led to various attempts to improve matters. On the one hand there were those who hoped to secure reforms by extending

<sup>1</sup> This was known as the doctrine of *laissez faire*, from the French phrase meaning "let things be," which was used by the economists of the eighteenth century. See above, § 148.




FIG. 64. ADAM SMITH





the right to vote, in order that the working classes might be represented in Parliament and so have laws passed to remedy the worst evils at least. In this movement some of the wealthier class often joined, but the working people were naturally chiefly interested and they embodied their ideas of reform in a great "People's Charter," which is described below in Chapter XIX.

**442. Trade-Unions.** In addition to this attempt to secure reform by political action, the workingmen formed unions of their own in the various trades and industries, in order to protect themselves by dealing in a body with their employers. This trade-union movement is one of the most important things in modern times. It began in the early part of the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> At first the formation of unions was forbidden by English law, and it was regarded as a crime for workingmen to combine to raise wages. Men were sentenced to imprisonment or deportation as convicts because they joined such "combinations," or unions. In 1824 Parliament repealed this harsh law, and trade-unions increased rapidly. They were hampered, however, by various restrictions, and even now, although they have spread widely all over the world, people are by no means agreed as to whether workingmen's unions are the best means of improving the conditions of the laboring classes.

**443. Socialism.** The third general plan for permanently bettering the situation of the working people is what is known as socialism. As this has played a great rôle in the history of Europe during the past fifty years, we must stop to examine the meaning of this word.

## V. THE RISE OF SOCIALISM

**444. The Question of the Ownership of Industry.** The socialists maintain that "the means of production" should belong to society and not be held as the private property of individuals. "The means of production" is a very vague phrase and might

<sup>1</sup> The craft guilds described in a previous chapter (see § 99) somewhat resembled modern labor unions, but they included both capitalists and laborers. Our labor unions did not grow out of the medieval guilds, but were organized to meet conditions that resulted from the Industrial Revolution.

include farms and gardens as well as tools ; but when the socialist uses it he is generally thinking of the *machines* which the Industrial Revolution has brought into the world and the factories



FIG. 65. ROBERT OWEN

Robert Owen rose from a mill worker to be a rich factory owner. He was convinced that mankind is naturally good and that the evil in society comes from bad surroundings. One of the worst influences, he thought, was the competitive system, which makes people try to get the best of one another ; while common ownership would, he thought, make each interested in the other's welfare

which house them, as well as the railroads and steamships which carry their goods, and the coal and iron mines. In short, the main idea of the socialists is that the great industries which have arisen as a result of the Industrial Revolution should not be left in private hands. They claim that it is not right for the capitalists to own the mills upon which the workingman must depend for his living ; that the attempt of labor unions to get higher wages does not offer more than a temporary relief, since the *system* is wrong which permits the wealthy to have

such a control over the poor. The person who works for wages, say the socialists, is not free ; he is a "wage slave" of his employer. The way to remedy this, they urge, is to turn over the great industries, now owned by capitalists, to the government of the nation, state, or city, so that all should have a share in the profits. This ideal state of society, which, they say, is sure to come in the future, they call the Coöperative Commonwealth.

**445. The Early Socialists.** The first socialists relied on the kind hearts of the capitalists to bring the change, once the situation was made clear. They dreamed of a future civilization which would be without poverty, idleness, or ugliness.<sup>1</sup> Of these early socialists the most attractive figure was Robert Owen, a rich British mill owner, who had much influence in England in the period of hard times after Waterloo. To him, probably, is due the word "socialism." There were also socialist writers and teachers in France who exercised a great influence over the working classes there during the second quarter of the century (see next chapter).

**446. Modern Socialists.** Modern socialists, however, regard these early socialists as dreamers and their methods as impracticable. They do not think that the rich will ever voluntarily give up their control over industries. So they turn to working people only, point out the great advantage to them of socialism, and call upon them to bring it about in the face of the opposition of the capitalists. They claim that wealth is produced by labor, for which capital but furnishes the opportunity, and that labor is justified in taking what it produces.<sup>2</sup>

**447. Karl Marx.** The great teacher of this modern doctrine of socialism was Karl Marx, a German writer who lived most of his life in London. He was a learned man, trained in philosophy and political economy, and he came to the conclusion from a study of history that just as the middle class or capitalists<sup>3</sup> had replaced feudal nobles, so the working class would replace the capitalists in the future. By the working class he meant those who depend upon their work for a living. The introduction of the factory system had reduced the vast majority of artisans to a position in

<sup>1</sup> Among these dreamers may be mentioned Sir Thomas More, who, in the time of Henry VIII, wrote the famous little book called *Utopia*, or "the land of nowhere," where everything was arranged as it should be, and where men lived together in brotherly love and prosperity. Since his day those who advocate any fundamental revolution in society have commonly been called Utopians.

<sup>2</sup> This does not mean that socialists would divide up all private property. Socialists claim only that there shall be no great amounts of unearned wealth in private hands, controlling, as now, the industries of the country. Brain workers are also "workers."

<sup>3</sup> The French term *bourgeoisie* is often used by socialists for this class.



which the capitalist was able to dictate the conditions upon which this work should be done. Marx, in an eloquent appeal to them




FIG. 66. KARL MARX

Karl Marx was born in 1818 in Treves, reared in an enlightened home, and educated at the universities of Bonn and Berlin. He had early decided upon the career of a university professor, but the boldness of his speech and his radical tendencies barred his way, and consequently he entered journalism. His attacks on the Prussian government led to the suppression of his paper in 1843, and he soon migrated to Paris. He was, however, expelled from France, and after some wanderings he finally settled in London, where he studied and wrote until his death, in 1883

Germany became a socialistic republic. It is necessary for every student of history to understand the movement (see below, § 452).

in 1847,<sup>1</sup> called upon the members of this "proletariat," "who have nothing to lose but their chains," to rise and seize the means of production themselves. His appeal had almost no effect at the time, but it has been an inspiration to later generations of socialists and is frequently quoted by them. Modern, or "Marxian," socialism is therefore a movement of the working class.

448. **Socialism an International Movement.** There is one other important element in socialism. It is international. It regards the cause of workers in different countries as a common cause against a common oppressor—the capitalists. In this way socialism was a force for peace between nations until the war of 1914. After the war an extreme form of socialism was introduced in Russia, and even

<sup>1</sup> The *Communist Manifesto*, written jointly with Frederick Engels. Marx used the word "communism" to distinguish his plan from the socialism of Owen and the "dreamers" who looked to capitalists to help.

QUESTIONS

I. What do you mean by the Industrial Revolution? Describe the contribution to the Industrial Revolution of each of the following men, giving dates of their inventions: Kay, Hargreaves, Arkwright, Crompton, Cartwright, Whitney.

II. Give an account of the invention of the steam engine. Give a short sketch of the Industrial Revolution in France.

III. What was the domestic system of industry? Contrast this system with the factory system.

IV. Outline the main results of the factory system. What is political economy? What is meant by individualism?

V. What is meant by socialism? Give a brief account of the life of Karl Marx. What difference is there between the socialism of Marx and that of the earlier socialists?

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) the invention of textile machinery, pp. 45-55; (2) James Watt and the steam engine, pp. 58-62; (3) the factory system, pp. 62-72.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Steam Engine, Loom, Cotton Gin, James Watt, Richard Arkwright, Trade Unionism, Socialism, Karl Marx, and Robert Owen.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the mechanical inventions, pp. 69-75; (2) the economic effects of the industrial revolution, pp. 75-88; (3) the effects of industry upon politics, pp. 88-97. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) the industrial revolution, pp. 25-34; (5) the results of the industrial revolution, pp. 34-44.

## CHAPTER XIII

### REVOLUTION OF 1848 IN FRANCE

#### I. UNPOPULARITY OF LOUIS PHILIPPE'S GOVERNMENT

**449. The "July Monarchy" and the Opposition.** The Revolution of 1830 gave the final blow in France to the divine right of kings. The sovereignty of the people was proclaimed in the revised Charter which Louis Philippe accepted from the parliament. He added to the former title—"King of the French by the Grace of God"—the significant phrase "and the Will of the Nation." But in spite of this only a small fraction of the nation had any part in the new government. The revised election law, which reduced the voting age from forty to thirty years and the property necessary to be a voter by one third, still excluded the majority of Frenchmen from political influence.

**450. The Legitimists.** The so-called "July monarchy" was stoutly opposed by two types of extremists—the adherents of the older Bourbon line (or Legitimists, as they were called) and the Republicans. The former regarded as their lawful king a grandson of Charles X, whom they called Henry V (see table, p. 214). This party was small; it was mainly recruited from the nobility and the clergy and was not given to violent measures, such as throwing up barricades and seizing public buildings.

**451. The Republicans.** It was an altogether different matter with the Republicans, who cherished the memories of 1793 and continued to threaten another violent revolution. This party carried on its work mainly through secret societies, similar to the Carbonari in Italy (§ 412), which spread rapidly in the new manufacturing towns. Remembering the ease with which they had shaken a monarch off the throne in 1830, the Republicans made several futile attempts to organize insurrections, which were speedily put down, however, by Louis Philippe's troops.

In addition to their other efforts to destroy the monarchy, the Republicans published a number of papers which attacked the government and even ventured to make fun of the king. But the police by the use of vigorous and tyrannical methods reduced the Republicans, as a political party, for the time being to insignificance.

**452. The Socialists and the Labor Movement in France.** Meanwhile there was growing up in the large industrial cities a socialistic party, which no mere change of rulers or extension of the suffrage would satisfy. Its members had seen the Republic, the Empire, and the Bourbon monarchy come and go, and constitutions made and unmade, leaving the peasants and workingmen in the same poverty as before. On the other hand, they had seen the nobles deprived of their privileges and the clergy of their property, and it was only natural that bold thinkers among them should demand that the triumphant middle class, who owed their wealth to commerce and the new machinery, should in turn be divested of some of their riches and privileges in the interest of the working classes.

**453. Babœuf advocates a Socialistic System.** Denunciations of private property and of the unequal distribution of wealth had been heard during the first French Revolution, but they had attracted little attention. Babœuf (1760-1797) had declared in



FIG. 67. LOUIS PHILIPPE

Louis Philippe lived without the pomp of royalty, and was fond of going shopping, almost unattended, carrying his green umbrella under his arm. He was cautious, grasping, and avaricious, and as time wore on he grew more and more conservative. His reign of eighteen years was a period of political stagnation



the days of the Terror that a *political* revolution left the condition of the people practically unchanged. What was needed, he claimed, was an *economic* revolution. "When I see the poor without the clothing and shoes which they themselves are engaged in making, and contemplate the small minority who do not work and yet want for nothing, I am convinced that government is still the old conspiracy of the few against the many, only it has taken a new form." His proposal to transfer all property to the State and so manage matters that everyone should be assured employment speedily found adherents, and a society was formed to usher in the new order. The organization was soon suppressed and Babeuf himself executed; but his writings were widely circulated, and after the July revolution in 1830 several groups of socialists began to agitate their plans of social revolution.

Some of these were dreamers, like Fourier, who wished to establish groups of coöperative workers in well-arranged settlements, living by themselves, where all would be happy in each other's welfare. Fourier relied, as did Robert Owen (§ 445), upon the kind hearts of philanthropists to start the movement.

454. Louis Blanc's *Organization of Labor* (1839). Of a different character, however, was the practical program of Louis Blanc, whose volume on *The Organization of Labor*, published in 1839, gave definiteness to the vague aspirations of the reformers. Blanc proclaimed the *right* of all men to employment and the duty of the State to provide it. He proposed that the government should furnish the capital to found national workshops, which should be managed by the workmen, who were to divide the profits of the industry among themselves, thus abolishing the employing class altogether. The "organization of labor" became the battle cry of the labor leaders; it was heard even in the Chamber of Deputies. Nevertheless, there was no well-organized Socialist party ready to enter the field and work for a definite aim.

455. Guizot's *Opposition to Reform*. Guizot, a famous historian, became prime minister in 1840, and he, together with the king himself, ruled France for eight years. Guizot wished the king to exercise real power; he did not want the throne to become

an "empty armchair" and regarded further changes in the constitution as undesirable. Though personally honorable, Guizot placed the government on a thoroughly corrupt basis and then attempted to stifle protest by police measures and the prosecution of newspaper editors. He steadily refused to undertake any legislation for the benefit of the working classes and opposed all efforts to extend the suffrage, maintaining that there were not more than one hundred thousand persons in all France "capable of voting with good judgment and independence." This extreme conservatism, which checked reform, brought instead a revolution.

## II. THE SECOND FRENCH REPUBLIC

**456. The Monarchy Overthrown (February, 1848).** In spite of Guizot's strong position, there were, in February, 1848, disturbances in the streets of Paris which frightened Louis Philippe and led to the resignation of the unpopular minister. But this did not restore quiet, for the leaders in the street disturbances wanted far more than a change in the ministry. During the evening of the twenty-third they made a formidable demonstration before the Foreign Office, where Guizot resided; thereupon the soldiers on guard fired upon and killed several of the rioters. This roused the anger of the populace to fever heat; the bodies of the victims were placed on a cart and carried along the boulevards. Before the dawn of February 24 the eastern part of the city was covered with barricades. In the narrow winding streets a cart or two and a heap of cobblestones formed an effective fortification.

**457. A Republic Proclaimed.** The entire city was soon in the hands of the insurgents, and Louis Philippe in despair abdicated in favor of his grandson, the count of Paris. Both the Republicans and the Labor party were determined to have no more royalty, so they proclaimed a republic on the afternoon of the twenty-fourth, subject to the ratification of the people in a national assembly to be summoned immediately.

**458. Labor holds the Balance of Power.** The moderate Republicans were quite satisfied with merely abolishing the monarchy,

but the workingmen, whose active coöperation had put the revolutionists in power, had set their hearts on introducing the whole scheme advocated by Louis Blanc. So they induced the provisional government to issue a decree establishing "national workshops" and empowering the minister of public works to put the plan into execution.

The provisional government established in the Luxembourg Palace, the former meeting place of the House of Peers, a labor committee charged with the special task of looking after the interests of the working classes. This was really a shrewd move on the part of the opponents of the "Socialists," for it sent the labor committee away from the meeting place of the provisional government to waste their time in making fine speeches and expounding theories. The labor committee accomplished very little, for the government had furnished them with no money, and consequently Louis Blanc and his supporters were powerless to carry out their plan for coöperative workshops, which they regarded as the most vital of all their reforms.

**459. The So-called "National Workshops."** The provisional government had, it is true, ordered the establishment of a kind of national workshops and issued a decree guaranteeing employment to all, but with very different motives from those of the labor committee. Louis Blanc and his followers sought to organize the various trades into *permanent, self-supporting coöperative* industries, financed in the beginning by the State, but managed by the workingmen themselves. The provisional government, on the contrary, merely desired to allay the restlessness of the unemployed by fair promises. It thought up jobs accordingly, which offered more or less useless employment to the idle men who thronged to Paris. It attempted no more than merely to organize into gangs those who applied for work, and set them to digging ditches and building forts at a uniform wage of two francs a day.

This crude temporary expedient was put into operation March 1, and in fifteen days six thousand men had enrolled in the government employ. In April the number reached a hundred thousand, and several million francs were being expended to pay these labor



gangs. The plan, however, worked from the standpoint of the provisional government—it kept the idle busy and prevented disorder until the conservative classes could regain their usual ascendancy.

**460. The National Assembly opposed to Socialism.** On May 4 the provisional government gave way to a National Assembly, elected by practically universal manhood suffrage, which was called upon to draw up a new republican constitution for the country. The majority of the deputies were moderate Republicans, who were bitterly opposed to all socialistic tendencies. The country districts which had taken no part in the Revolution could now make themselves felt, and it was clear enough that the representatives of the peasants did not sympathize with the projects and demands of the Paris workingmen. They had no use for Socialists or national workshops.



FIG. 68. CONFLICT BETWEEN WORKINGMEN AND THE TROOPS IN PARIS, JUNE, 1848

**461. The Terrible "June Days" of 1848.** Before it could proceed to consider seriously the form of the new constitution, the National Assembly was forced to take decisive measures in regard to the "national workshops," to which crowds continued to flock, draining the treasury to pay for their useless labor. It soon resolved to close the "workshops" and ordered the men either to join the army or leave the city. The people at once set up the cry of "bread or lead," and the most terrible street fighting that Paris had ever witnessed ensued. The streets inhabited by the



working classes were again torn up for barricades, and from Friday, June 23, until the following Monday a desperate conflict raged. The Assembly, fearing the triumph of the Labor party, appointed General Cavaignac to crush the revolt.

Victory was inevitably on the side of the government troops, who were well disciplined and well equipped, while the insurgents fought irregularly and were half-starved. In its hour of triumph the government's retaliation was most unjustifiably severe; for about four thousand citizens were transported without trial to criminal colonies, thirty-two newspapers were suppressed, and the leading writers among the radicals imprisoned. Order was restored, but the carnage of the "June days" left a heritage of undying hatred between the workingmen and the capitalists of Paris.

*Algeria*

**462. Constitution of the Second French Republic.** After this cruel "solution" of the labor problem the Assembly turned to the work of drawing up a constitution. In spite of a strong royalist minority, the Assembly had declared itself in favor of a republic on the very first day of meeting. It revived the motto of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" and urged all Frenchmen to forget their former dissensions and "to constitute henceforth but a single family."

After six months of debate a new constitution was promulgated. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and guaranteed religious freedom and liberty of the press. The government was vested in an assembly elected by the people, and in a president chosen also by the votes of the people for a term of four years.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The course of events in Europe during the momentous years from 1830 to 1848 was closely watched by the leaders of opinion in America. The old affection between France and the United States was renewed in 1824-1825, when Lafayette visited us for the last time, and the American people read with deep interest accounts of his part in the Revolution of 1830. When the news of that uprising reached New York City the mayor, the aldermen, and eminent citizens joined in a great parade to celebrate the second overthrow of the Bourbons.


The French on their part reciprocated American interest. In 1831, while Andrew Jackson was president, the distinguished French writer Alexis de Tocqueville visited ~~the~~ country and collected the materials for his brilliant book entitled *Democracy in America*, in which he paid tribute to ~~our~~ successful experiment in self-government. When in 1848 the French undertook to frame a new republican constitution, they studied carefully the Constitution of the United States and referred to it frequently during the debates on their new plan of government.

**463. Louis Napoleon aspires to rule France.** After the establishment of the constitution, interest centered in the first presidential election, held on December 10, 1848. Three leading candidates entered the contest, Ledru-Rollin, representing the Labor party, General Cavaignac, who had so ruthlessly suppressed the June insurrection, and Louis Napoleon, a nephew of Napoleon I.

The last of these candidates had up to this time led a varied and interesting life. He was born in Paris while his father, Louis Napoleon, was king of Holland. After his uncle's downfall, when he was six years old, he was expelled from France with his mother, who wandered about with him for some time. She continually impressed upon his youthful mind the fact that one who bore the great name of Bonaparte was destined to accomplish something in the world, and he came firmly to believe that it was his mission to reestablish the Napoleonic dynasty in France.

After the death of Napoleon I's son ("Napoleon II") in 1832<sup>1</sup> he put himself forward as the direct claimant to the imperial crown, and four years later he attempted to provoke a military uprising at Strasbourg, designed to put him on the throne of France. This proved a miserable failure. He then settled in England, where he published in 1839 a volume on *Napoleonic Ideas*, in which he represented Napoleon as defending the principles of the Revolution, and as the guardian of the rights of the people. In short, he created a fictitious Napoleon who hoped and labored only for the good of the people, and who was overthrown by the European tyrants. A second attempt in 1840 to make himself ruler of France also failed, and the unhappy leader was

<sup>1</sup> Chief members of the Napoleonic House :



shut up in a fortress, from which, in 1846, he escaped to England to await the good fortune to which he still firmly believed himself destined.

**464. Louis Napoleon elected President.** On the outbreak of the revolution in 1848 Louis Napoleon had returned to Paris and now offered himself as a candidate for the presidency and issued a campaign manifesto, as adroitly worded as many of his famous uncle's proclamations, in which he promised the working classes special laws for their benefit; but, on the other hand, he distinctly repudiated all socialistic schemes and reassured the middle classes by guaranteeing order and the security of property. His plans worked admirably, for he was elected president by an overwhelming majority, five and a half million votes to less than one million and a half cast for the other two candidates combined.

### III. LOUIS NAPOLEON AND THE SECOND FRENCH EMPIRE

**465. The *Coup d'État* of December, 1851.** It soon became clear that the man whom the French had put at the head of their second republic was bent on making himself emperor. He speedily began to work for a revision of the constitution that would extend his term of office from four to ten years. He selected his ministers from among his personal friends, courted the favor of the army, and by journeys through the country sought to arouse the enthusiasm of the people for the restoration of the empire.

As the Assembly refused to cooperate in his plans he finally determined to risk a *coup d'état* (§ 278), which he had been meditating for some time. The morning of December 2, 1851—the anniversary of the victory of Austerlitz—found the walls of Paris placarded with copies of a decree issued by the president, dissolving the Assembly, reestablishing universal suffrage, and ordering a new election.

**466. The Plebiscitum.** Finally, he submitted to the people of France the following proposition: "The French people desire the maintenance of the authority of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and delegate to him the necessary powers in order to make a constitution

on the basis announced in his proclamation of December 2." Every Frenchman twenty-one years of age was permitted to vote "yes" or "no" on this proposition, and the result was officially estimated at 7,740,000 for the measure and 646,000 against it.

**467. How Napoleon III disposed of his Opponents.** Save for a little bloodshed in Paris on December 4, this revolution was

carried out very quietly. About a hundred thousand opponents of Napoleon throughout the country, including among others the leaders of the opposition in the Assembly, were arrested, and nearly ten thousand were exiled from France, but the people at large accepted the new head of the state without pro-



FIG. 69. NAPOLEON III

test. The workingmen generally rejoiced in the overthrow of the politicians who had waged war on them in the bloody June days of 1848.

**468. The Second Empire Established (1852).** The president was now master of France. He appointed officers, proposed laws, declared war, made peace, and in fact himself exercised the real power in the government. Though already an emperor in reality, he was not satisfied until he secured the title, and it was evident that the country was ready for the fulfillment of his hopes for wherever he went he was greeted with cries of "Long live the Emperor." Toward the close of 1852 a decree was submitted to popular vote making the president, Napoleon III, emperor of the French. This was ratified by an overwhelming



majority. The dream of Louis Napoleon's life was at last realized—the Napoleonic dynasty was restored.

**469. The Despotic Rule of Napoleon III.** For over ten years his government was a thinly veiled despotism. Though the imperial constitution confirmed the great principles of the Revolution, a decree abolishing the liberty of the press was immediately issued. No periodical or newspaper treating of political or social questions could be published without previous authorization on the part of the government. Napoleon III had promised liberty of teaching, but he compelled the teachers in the university to take an oath of allegiance to himself. Instruction in history and philosophy was discouraged as unsettling the minds of the young.

**470. The Prosperity of France (1852-1870).** Notwithstanding this autocratic régime, the country was prosperous and the people fairly contented. If the emperor was a despot, he endeavored—and with no little success—to be an enlightened one. Benevolent institutions increased in number. Railway construction was rapidly pushed forward, and great trunk lines which had been begun under Louis Philippe were completed. The city of Paris was improved and beautified; the narrow streets were widened and broad avenues laid out. Moreover, in 1870, Napoleon yielded to the growing demand for a reform of the constitution, and established the responsibility of his ministers to parliament. If it had not been for a series of foreign events which weakened his reputation at home, Napoleon III might have kept his throne until his death. But in 1870 the war between France and Prussia brought his reign to a humiliating end (see below, §§ 532 ff.).

### QUESTIONS

I. Give a sketch of the two parties which opposed the "July monarchy." Discuss the proposals of Babœuf and Blanc. What was the policy of Guizot?

II. Give an account of the February revolution in Paris. Discuss the episode of the "national workshops." What were the "June days of 1848"? Describe the constitution of the Second French Republic. Sketch the life of Louis Napoleon to the year 1848.

III. What means did Louis Napoleon take to reëstablish the empire? Characterize the government of Napoleon III. What did the empire do for France?

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) the spirit of criticism and reform in France, pp. 73-78; (2) the Second French Republic, pp. 78-84; (3) Louis Napoleon and the Second French Empire, pp. 84-94.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Louis Blanc, F. P. Guizot, Louis Philippe, Alexis de Tocqueville, François Charles Fourier, Claude H. de R. Saint-Simon, and Auguste Comte.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the democratic revolution in France, pp. 116-123; (2) reaction and the Second French Empire, pp. 150-163. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (3) reaction and revolution in France, pp. 89-110; (4) the romantic movement in French literature, pp. 110-114; (5) the Second French Empire, pp. 145-168.

## CHAPTER XIV

### REVOLUTION OF 1848 — AUSTRIA, GERMANY, ITALY

#### I. THE FALL OF METTERNICH

**471. New Forces in the Revolution of 1848.** When Metternich heard of the February revolution in France all his old fears were revived. "Europe finds herself to-day," he declared, "in the presence of a second 1793." Great changes had, however, taken place during the fifty-five years which had elapsed since France first offered to aid other nations to free themselves from their "tyrants" and throw off the bonds of feudalism. In 1848 the principles proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man were accepted by the liberal parties which had come into existence in every state of Europe, and which were actively engaged in promoting the cause of democratic government, a free press, equality of all before the law, and the abolition of the vestiges of the feudal system.

Moreover, the national spirit (§ 326), which had awakened during the Napoleonic Period, was at work and served more than anything else to excite opposition to the existing order. Lastly, the Industrial Revolution was beginning to quicken the thought and arouse the aspirations of the great mass of the population. Those who lived by the labor of their hands and were employed in the new factories which were rapidly developing, now had their spokesmen, especially in France and England. They claimed their right to vote and to mold the laws to meet their particular interests. So in 1848 the rights of nations and of the laborer were added to the rights of "man," which had been considered the main issue in 1793.

**472. Revolutionary Movements throughout Western Europe.** In nearly every European country the liberals were encouraged by the successful February revolution in Paris to

undertake to win, by violence if necessary, the reforms which they had so long been advocating. In England a body of workingmen, known as "Chartists," made a desperate though futile effort to wring from Parliament the right to vote (§ 627 below). The Swiss, who had just passed through a civil conflict, swept away the constitution which had been adopted in 1814 and drew up a new one.<sup>1</sup> But the chief agitations of 1848, outside of France, were directed against the governments of Germany and Austria, where Metternich had for forty years been doing his best to prevent any hint of change.

**473. Mixture of Peoples under Austrian Rule.** But before proceeding it will be necessary to consider more carefully than we have hitherto done the various peoples within the realms of the House of Hapsburg. The regions west of Vienna, extending to Switzerland and Bavaria, were inhabited chiefly by Germans. To the south, in the provinces of Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, and Istria, there were many Slavs; and to the north, in Bohemia and Moravia, were the Czechs, interspersed among twice their number of Germans. To the east were the Slovaks, akin to the Czechs. On the borders of Russia dwelt the Poles, whose territories the Austrian emperor had received by the partitions of Poland. The inhabitants of the kingdom of Hungary included, besides the Magyars, or Hungarians proper (who dwelt in the vast plains of

<sup>1</sup> The settlement of 1815 in Switzerland, like that in Germany, Italy, and other European countries, met with opposition from the liberals. It had left the internal government of each canton in the hands of a small minority of the wealthy classes, and had modeled the diet on that of Germany, making it merely a congress of ambassadors with slight powers. Agitation for a revision of this system was begun immediately after its establishment, but any change was opposed especially by the Catholics, who were in a minority and feared that a stronger central government would be used by the Protestants to restrict their rights. In 1841 the government of Aargau precipitated a civil conflict by suppressing the monasteries within its jurisdiction. Although the Swiss constitution guaranteed the monasteries in their rights, the federal government refused to interfere with the domestic concerns of Aargau. Thereupon the Catholic cantons, under the leadership of Lucerne, Uri, and Zug, formed a Catholic alliance, or *Sonderbund*, which defied the entire democratic and nationalist party. After some skirmishes which scarcely deserve the name of war, this party of disunion was suppressed, and in 1848 a new federal constitution was drawn up. Instead of a diet of ambassadors it provided for a Senate representing the states and for Representatives elected by the people at large, on the plan of the government of the United States. This constitution was revised in 1874, when still larger powers were given to the federal government.




the Danube valley), Rumanians to the east and the independence-loving Croats (Croatians) in the south and west. Beyond the Alps was the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom inhabited by Italians. Among this mass of people of different tongues and traditions the most important were the Germans of Austria, the Czechs of Bohemia, the Magyars of Hungary, and the Italians in Lombardy and Venetia.

**474. The Government of Austria.** In the provinces of the Austrian Empire, Ferdinand I ruled personally through ministers whom he appointed and dismissed. Laws were made, taxes levied, and revenues spent without consulting the people. Newspapers, books, theaters, and teachers were watched closely by the police to prevent the introduction of any new ideas. Travel abroad was restricted by a decree which required every citizen leaving the realm to have a government passport. Scholars were therefore largely cut off from the thought of western Europe, and Metternich boasted that the scientific spirit had been kept out of even the universities. The nobles still enjoyed their ancient authority over their serfs, including the right to prevent their leaving the villages without permission and to exact from them the old feudal services. The clergy were as powerful as they had been before the French Revolution, and non-Catholics were excluded entirely from government offices.

**475. Hungary controlled by the Magyar Nobles.** In the kingdom of Hungary the government was under the control of the proud and tyrannical Magyar nobles, who still enjoyed their old feudal privileges. There was a diet, or parliament, composed of an upper house of nobles, and a lower house of representatives chosen by the smaller landlords. Although the Magyars, or Hungarians proper,<sup>1</sup> constituted less than one half of the population, they held their neighbors—the Croats, Rumanians, and Slovaks—in contempt and denied them all national rights. There were,

<sup>1</sup> The Hungarians — who belong to a very different race from the Slavic peoples, more akin to the Mongolian or Tartar, and speak the Magyar tongue — invaded the Danube valley in the year 895, and wedged themselves in between the Slavic Russians and Poles on the north and the "South Slavs," composed of Croats, Slovenes, Serbians, and Montenegrins.



ETHNOGRAPHIC MAP OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY IN 1848

however, enlightened liberals in Hungary, whose program included the admission of the public to the discussions in the diet, a par-



FIG. 70. LOUIS KOSSUTH

Kossuth was a wonderful orator, speaking with passionate, fiery eloquence. He was largely responsible for the Magyars' revolt in 1848, and became their virtual dictator during it. After it was crushed he fled to Turkey, then visited France, England, and the United States. He had learned in prison the tongue of Shakespeare and the King James Bible, and surprised everyone by his eloquent command of English. His great popularity was later clouded by the protests of other refugees that he was claiming altogether too much for himself. From 1859 to his death, in 1894, he lived in Italy, refusing to return home while a Hapsburg was ruling over Hungary

liametary journal in which the debates should be published in full, regular yearly meetings of the diet, equal taxation of all classes, and the abolition of the forced labor required of the peasant and all other vestiges of serfdom.

**476. Kossuth (1802-1894).** The government did all it could to suppress these tendencies. The publication of reform speeches was forbidden, and a prominent Hungarian leader, Kossuth, was imprisoned for circulating them in manuscript. Undaunted by this punishment, however, Kossuth, on his release, established a newspaper at Pesth and began to advocate radical reforms in the Hungarian government itself as well as greater freedom from Austrian interference. In his writing and speaking he advocated with fiery zeal the abolition of the ancient feudal rights which still held the Hungarian

peasants in a state of medieval serfdom. He advocated the introduction of trial by jury, the revision of the barbarous criminal law, and various other fundamental reforms.



**477. Causes of Discontent in Lombardo-Venetia.** The Italians in Lombardo-Venetia were no less dissatisfied than the Hungarians. The Austrian government there was in the hands of police officials and judges who arrested and imprisoned freely all advocates of Italian rights. Tariffs were so arranged as to enrich the emperor's treasury and check Italian industries in favor of those of Austria. The forts were garrisoned with Austrian troops which the government employed to suppress any violent demonstrations.

**478. The March Revolution in Vienna.** The ground was therefore thoroughly prepared for the seeds of insurrection when the overthrow of Louis Philippe encouraged the opponents of Metternich in Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Italy to hope that they could destroy his system at once and forever. On March 13, 1848, a number of students in Vienna proceeded to the assembly hall where the local diet was in session, and, supported by the crowd that quickly gathered, invaded the building. Outside, the mob continued to increase, barricades were built, street fighting began, and shouts of "Down with Metternich!" penetrated the imperial palace.

**479. Fall of Metternich.** The aged minister, convinced that it was no longer possible to check the rising torrent of revolution, tendered his resignation. He fled from Austria and found refuge in England, where he was heartily welcomed by his old friend the Duke of Wellington, who was himself occupied with a threatened uprising in London. After the flight of Metternich a new ministry was formed, which began to draft a constitution.

## II. UPRISINGS IN CENTRAL EUROPE

**480. Revolution in Hungary.** Two days after the uprising in Vienna the Hungarian diet at Pressburg, by a unanimous vote, dispatched a delegation to the emperor, demanding a responsible ministry, freedom of the press, trial by jury, and a national educational system. Then the Hungarian diet, under the influence of the zealous patriot Kossuth, swept away the old offices through which the emperor had ruled in Hungary and established its own



ministries of finance, war, and foreign affairs—a first step toward independence. It also emancipated the peasants without providing compensation to the landlords, leaving that as a “debt of honor” to be paid in the future. The Austrian ruler, owing to the insurrection in Vienna, was in no position to reject even these revolutionary measures.

**481. Revolution in Prague.** His troubles were, moreover, not yet at an end, for on March 15 the patriotic Czechs in the city of Prague held a mass meeting at which a petition for civil liberty and the abolition of serfdom was drawn up. Solemn mass was then said, and a delegation bearing the petition left by special train for Vienna amid the cheers of the crowd and the waving of Czech flags. The emperor addressed the Bohemian delegates, to their great joy, in their own language and approved most of their proposals. It will be observed that so far neither in Hungary nor in Bohemia had the patriots shown any desire to throw off their allegiance to their Austrian ruler.

**482. Revolution throughout Italy (March, 1848).** In Italy, however, the Austrian rule was thoroughly hated. Immediately on hearing the news of Metternich’s fall the Milanese expelled the Austrian troops from their city, and the Austrians were soon forced to evacuate a great part of Lombardy. The Venetians followed the lead of Milan and set up once more their ancient republic, which Napoleon had suppressed (§ 269). The Milanese, anticipating a struggle, appealed to Charles Albert, king of Sardinia, for aid. By the middle of March a great part of Italy was in revolt, and constitutions had been granted by the rulers in Naples, Rome, Tuscany, and Piedmont. The king of Sardinia was forced by public opinion to assume the leadership in the attempt to expel Austria from Italy and ultimately perhaps to found some sort of Italian union which would satisfy the national aspirations of the Italian people. Pope Pius IX, who was just beginning his long and celebrated pontificate of more than thirty years, and even the Bourbon king of Naples were induced to consent to the arming of troops in the cause of Italian freedom, and thus Italy began her first war for independence.

**483. The Prussians demand a Constitution.** The crisis in Vienna and the war in Italy now made it impossible for Austria to continue to exercise the control over the German states which she had enjoyed for more than thirty years. Consequently there were almost simultaneous risings in Baden, Würtemberg, Bavaria, and Saxony. The news of the February revolution in Paris caused great excitement also in Berlin, where deputations were sent to the king, asking him to grant Prussia a constitution. On March 18 a crowd gathered before the royal palace and the police tried to disperse it; fighting ensued, and barricades were constructed after the Paris fashion in the districts in which the working people lived. Frederick William IV, hoping to avoid further disorder and bloodshed, promised to summon an assembly to draft the desired constitution.

**484. The German National Assembly (May, 1848).** Now that Metternich was overthrown there was some hope of reorganizing the weak German Confederation (§ 398) and forming a new and firm union which would at last make a real nation of the Germans. At the instigation of the liberals the diet of the confederation convoked a National Assembly made up of representatives chosen by popular vote in all the states. This met at Frankfurt, May 18, 1848, amid high hopes and proceeded to take up the difficult question of drafting a constitution which should please at once the German princes and their liberal-minded subjects.<sup>1</sup>

**485. Bright Outlook for Reform in March, 1848.** By the end of March, 1848, the prospects of reform seemed bright indeed. Hungary and Bohemia had been granted the rights which they had so long desired; a committee in Vienna was busy drawing up a constitution for the Austrian provinces; Lombardy and Venetia had declared their independence; four other Italian states had obtained their longed-for constitutions; a Prussian convention to reform the government had been promised; and,

<sup>1</sup> The events of the year 1848 moved so rapidly that one is likely to be at first confused by them. It must be remembered that the revolutionary movements in the separate countries of Germany, such as Austria, Prussia, Baden, etc., were quite different from the attempt to reform the *whole* confederation, which has just been referred to.

lastly, a great national assembly was about to be convened at Frankfort to prepare a constitution for Germany.

The reformers who had gained these seeming victories had, however, only just reached the most difficult part of their task. For, as in France, so also in the other countries, the revolutionists were divided among themselves, and this division enabled the reactionary rulers and their supporters to recover from the extraordinary humiliations which they had suffered during the various uprisings in March.

### III. GENERAL FAILURE OF THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848

**486. Suppression of Revolution in the Lands of the Hapsburgs.** Within two years the reformers were beaten everywhere, although not all their reforms were swept away. In the summer of 1848 an Austrian general, Windischgrätz, bombarded Prague and on entering the flaming streets proclaimed the Czech revolution at an end. In the autumn he attacked and captured Vienna, showing no mercy to the leaders in the recent uprising. A reactionary ministry was now formed; a new Metternich in the person of Schwarzenberg was discovered; and the weak Ferdinand was forced to abdicate in favor of his youthful nephew, Francis Joseph, who was destined to rule for nearly sixty-eight years. With Vienna well in hand, the reactionaries turned to Hungary. Aided by the Russian Tsar, they stamped out the movement for Hungarian independence, shot and imprisoned hundreds of rebels, and drove others, including Kossuth, into exile. Thus the ancient Kingdom of Hungary was reduced to vassalage.

**487. Fate of the Italian Revolution.** At the same time the rebellious Italians were conquered by Austrian arms. The Sardinian king, Charles Albert, was defeated at Custoza in 1848 and again at Novara in 1849 and forced to abdicate in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel, who was destined in due time to become "king of Italy." The republics which had been set up at Rome, Venice, and Florence were speedily suppressed. The democratic constitutions were all swept aside except one granted by

King Charles Albert in Sardinia. Victor Emmanuel not only maintained the representative government established by his father but summoned to his council well-known liberals to aid him in preparing for the day of Italy's liberation.

**488. Question of the Extent of the German Union.** In Germany, as elsewhere, Austria profited by the dissensions among her opponents. On May 18, 1848, the national assembly, consisting of nearly six hundred representatives of the German people, had met at Frankfurt. It immediately began the consideration of a new constitution that should satisfy the popular longings for a great free German state, in which the people should have a voice. But what were to be the confines of this new German state?

The Confederation of 1815 did not include all the German inhabitants of Prussia and did include the western possessions of Austria—Bohemia and Moravia, for example, where many of the people were Slavs. There was no hesitation in deciding that all the Prussian territories should be admitted to the new union. As it appeared impossible to leave out Austria altogether, the assembly agreed to include those parts of her territory which had belonged to the unsatisfactory old confederation created in 1815, which they were now trying to reform.



FIG. 71. FRANCIS JOSEPH AT HIS ACCESSION

Francis Joseph (1830-1916) witnessed the revolutions of 1848 at the age of eighteen and the World War of 1914 at the age of eighty-four. Pictures of him as an old man are familiar; but this one of him at his accession recalls to us his long reign

*Austria*



**489. Impossibility of including both Austria and Prussia.**

This decision rendered the task of founding a real German state practically impossible; for the new union was to include two great European powers which might at any moment become rivals, since Prussia would hardly consent to be led forever by Austria. So heterogeneous a union could only continue to be, as it had been, a loose confederation of practically independent princes.

**490. The Assembly's Delay gives Austria Time to Recover.**

Instead of proceeding immediately to frame a new form of government, the Frankfort assembly devoted several months to formulating the general rights of the individual citizen. Consequently by the time that the constitution itself came up for discussion Austria had begun to regain her influence and was ready to lead the conservative forces once more. She could rely upon the support of the rulers of the states of southern Germany, for they were well satisfied with the old confederation and the degree of independence that it gave them.

**491. German Crown refused by King of Prussia.** In spite of her fondness for the old union, Austria could not prevent the assembly from completing its new constitution. This provided that there should be an hereditary emperor at the head of the government, and that exalted office was offered to the king of Prussia. Frederick William IV had, owing to an insurrection in Berlin, become suspicious of the measures proposed by the reformers. He was, moreover, timid and conservative; he hated revolution and doubted whether the national assembly had any right to give him the title of emperor.

He also greatly respected Austria and felt that a war with her, which was likely to ensue if he accepted the crown, would be dangerous to Prussia. So he refused the imperial title and announced his rejection of the new German constitution (April, 1849). This decision rendered fruitless the year's work of the national assembly, and its members gradually dispersed. Austria now insisted upon the reëstablishment of the old diet; the former weak government was again put into operation and Germany returned once more to her old ways.

**492. The Prussian Constitution of 1849.** Yet amid the meager results of the Revolution of 1848 there was one event of importance for the future of Germany: Prussia emerged from the turmoil of the period with a written constitution which established a legislative assembly and admitted a portion of the people to a slight share in the government. As we have seen, the news of the revolution in France caused great excitement in Berlin, and the king, Frederick William IV, fearing a continuance of violence, promised to convoke an assembly to draw up a constitution. This convention met at Berlin in May of the same year and advocated many radical measures which displeased the king. It proposed to abolish the nobility and to strike from the royal title the phrase "King by the Grace of God."

Meanwhile there was disorder in the quarters occupied by the working class, and on June 14 a mob stormed the royal arsenal. This situation frightened the king, and he dissolved the assembly in spite of its protests. After thus getting rid of the democratic assembly, the king, in 1849, submitted a constitution of his own to a more easily managed convention of carefully selected members. This document, which was proclaimed in January, 1850, remained, with some minor changes, the constitution of the Prussian state until the overthrow of the Hohenzollerns at the close of the World War in 1918.

**493. The New Prussian Constitution and the Powers of the King.** It proved, however, a great disappointment to the liberals, who had hoped for a really democratic form of government. It made the ministry responsible to the king, not the parliament; it permitted the king to choose many of the peers; and, finally, it gave the votes of the rich far more influence than those of the laboring class (§ 550 below).

#### QUESTIONS

I. Show the effect of the February revolution upon the English and the Swiss. Over what lands and peoples did the House of Hapsburg rule in 1848? Describe the government of Austria; of Hungary. Who was Kossuth? What were the objections of the Italians in Lombardo-Venetia to Austrian rule? Describe the March revolution in Vienna.

II. Give an account of the reform legislation of the Hungarian diet. What were the demands of the Bohemians in March, 1848? Trace the course of the revolution in Italy. What were the demands of the liberals in Prussia at this period? How were they met?

III. Describe the manner in which the different revolutionary movements were put down. Describe the result of the defeat by Austria of the king of Sardinia at Novara.

What problem faced the members of the National Assembly which met at Frankfort, May, 1848? Account for the refusal of Frederick William IV to accept the imperial title offered to him by the national assembly. What was the effect of his act upon the work of this assembly? What permanent gain was made by Prussia as a result of the Revolution of 1848?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) the fall of Metternich, pp. 95-101; (2) Kossuth's appeal to the United States, pp. 103-108; (3) constitutional government in Italy, pp. 108-110; (4) the outcome of the revolution in Germany, pp. 110-114.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Metternich, Switzerland, Louis Kossuth, Charles Albert (of Sardinia), Francis Joseph (of Austria), Frederick William IV (of Prussia).

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) uprisings in Central Europe, pp. 123-133; (2) attempts at constitutional reform, pp. 133-136; (3) reaction and outcome of the revolutions, pp. 136-144. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) the development of Germany, pp. 115-128; (5) the revolution of 1848 in Central Europe, pp. 128-138; (6) intellectual progress of Germany, pp. 139-144.

## CHAPTER XV

### THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

#### I. PLANS FOR UNITING ITALY

494. **Italy in 1850.** The efforts of the Italian liberals to expel Austria from the peninsula and establish constitutional governments in the various Italian states had failed, and after the battle of Novara it seemed as if the former conditions were to be restored. The king of Naples broke all the promises which he had made to his subjects, revoked the constitution which he had granted, and imprisoned, exiled, or in some cases executed the revolutionists. The Pope, with the assistance of France, Austria, Naples, and Spain, was able to destroy the Roman Republic which had been set up and to place the government again in the hands of the clergy.

In northern Italy Austria was once more in control, and she found faithful adherents in the rulers of Modena, Parma, and Tuscany, who looked to her for continued support. The leading spirits of the revolution who had escaped prison or death fled to foreign countries to await a more auspicious opportunity to secure their ends, for they did not give up the hope that Austria would sometime be driven from their country and all the Italian states brought together in a federation or perhaps united into a single monarchy or republic.

495. **Divisions among the Reformers.** However, those who, since the fall of Napoleon I, had been interested in promoting Italian independence and liberty differed among themselves as to the best way in which to make Italy a nation. There were the republicans, who became more and more disgusted with monarchy and believed that nothing could be accomplished until the various rulers should give way to a great democratic republic, which should



recall the ancient glories of Rome; others were confident that an enlightened Pope could form an Italian federation, of which he should be the head; lastly, there was a practical party, whose adherents placed their hopes in the king of Sardinia, who seemed to them to be the natural leader in the emancipation of Italy. Little as the Revolution of 1848 had accomplished, it had at least




FIG. 72. MAZZINI

given Sardinia a young and energetic king and a new constitution.

**496. Mazzini (1805-1872).**

Among the republican leaders the most conspicuous was the sensitive and highly endowed Giuseppe Mazzini. Born in 1805, he had, as he tells us, become a republican from hearing his father discuss the achievements of the French Revolution, and had read eagerly the old French newspapers which he found hidden behind the medical books in his father's li-

brary. He joined the secret society of the Carbonari (§ 412), and in 1830 was caught by the police and imprisoned in a fortress west of Genoa. Here he arranged a secret code which enabled him to keep in communication with the revolutionists.

**497. "Young Italy."** Becoming disgusted with the inefficiency and the silly mystery of the Carbonari, Mazzini planned a new association, which he called Young Italy. This aimed to bring about the regeneration of Italy through the education of young men in lofty republican principles. Mazzini had no confidence in princes or in foreign aid. He urged that all the Italians should be brought together into a single republic, for he feared that any form of federation would leave the country too weak to resist the constant

interference of neighboring nations. Mazzini was not a man to carry through a successful revolution, for he lacked the necessary practical business sense, but he inspired the young Italians with almost religious enthusiasm for the cause of Italy's liberation.

**498. Progressive Government of Victor Emmanuel.** The future, however, did not belong to the republicans, but to those who looked to the king of Sardinia to bring about the salvation of Italy. Only under his leadership was there any prospect of ousting Austria, and until that was done no independent union could possibly be formed. Therefore practical men began to turn to the young Victor Emmanuel, whose devotion to the cause of freedom in the war with Austria in 1848 and whose frank acceptance of the principles of constitutional government distinguished him from all the other rulers of Italy. His father, Charles Albert, had granted Piedmont



FIG. 73. CAVOUR

a constitution in 1848, which provided for a parliament with two houses and a responsible ministry. This constitution (which was later to become that of a united Italy) Victor Emmanuel maintained in spite of Austria's demands that he suppress it.

**499. Count Cavour (1810-1861).** Victor Emmanuel was wise enough to call to his aid one of the most distinguished of modern statesmen, Count Cavour, who had long been an advocate both of constitutional government and of Italian unity. Cavour, however, did not believe that unity could be secured without foreign aid, for Sardinia was a rather insignificant kingdom when compared with the more important countries of Europe. It had a population

of less than five millions and consisted of four distinct regions which were more or less hostile to one another. In view of this fact Cavour held that it was impossible to disregard the other powers of Europe, who had so long interfered freely in Italian affairs. In particular he looked to France. He early declared, "Whether we like it or not, our destinies depend upon France; we must be her partner in the great game which will be played sooner or later in Europe."

## II. RÔLE OF NAPOLEON III IN ITALY

**500. Cavour wins the Support of Napoleon III.** An opportunity soon offered itself for Sardinia to become the ally of France. The Crimean War (§ 777 below) had broken out in 1854 between England and France on the one side and Russia on the other, and in 1855 Cavour signed an offensive and defensive alliance with France and sent troops to her aid in the Crimea. This gave him an opportunity to take part in the European congress which met in Paris in 1856 to conclude a peace (§ 778 below). There he warned the powers that Austrian control in northern Italy was a menace to the peace of Europe, and succeeded in enlisting the interest of Napoleon III in Italian affairs; it will be remembered that in his younger days the French emperor had sympathized with the Carbonari, and he had a number of Italian relatives who besought his aid in forwarding the cause of Italian unity.

**501. Position of Napoleon III.** There were other reasons too why Napoleon was ready to consider interfering in Italy. Like his distinguished uncle, he was after all only a usurper. He knew that he must maintain his popularity by deeds that should redound to the glory of France. A war with Austria for the liberation of the Italians, who, like the French, were a Latin race, would be popular, especially if France could thereby add a bit of territory to her realms and perhaps become the protector of the proposed Italian confederation. A conference was arranged between Napoleon and Cavour. Just what agreement was reached we do not know, but Napoleon apparently engaged to come to the aid of

the king of Sardinia should the latter find a pretense for going to war with Austria. Should they together succeed in expelling Austria from northern Italy, the king of Sardinia was to reward France by ceding to her Savoy and Nice, which belonged to her geographically and racially.

**502. Sardinia and France unite against Austria (1859).** By April, 1859, Victor Emmanuel had managed to involve himself in a war with Austria. The French army promptly joined the Sardinian forces, defeated the Austrians at Magenta, and on June 8 Napoleon III and Victor Emmanuel entered Milan amid the rejoicings of the people. The Austrians managed the campaign very badly and were again defeated at Solferino (June 24).

**503. Napoleon III unexpectedly consents to a Truce.** Suddenly Europe was astonished to hear that a truce had been concluded and that the preliminaries of a peace had been arranged which left Venetia in Austria's hands, in spite of Napoleon III's boast that he would free Italy to the Adriatic. The French emperor was shocked, however, by the horrors of a real battlefield; he believed, moreover, that it would require three hundred thousand soldiers to drive the Austrians from northern Italy, and he could not draw further upon the resources of France. Lastly, he had begun to fear that, in view of the growing enthusiasm which was showing itself throughout the peninsula for Sardinia, there was danger that it might succeed in forming a national kingdom so strong as to need no French protector. By leaving Venetia in the possession of Austria and agreeing that the kingdom of Sardinia should only be increased by the incorporation of Lombardy and the little duchies of Parma and Modena, Napoleon III hoped to prevent the consolidation of Italy from proceeding too far. He had, however, precipitated changes which he was powerless to check. Italy was now ready to fuse into a single state.

**504. Kingdom of Sardinia Enlarged (1859).** During the months of August and September, 1859, the people in the three duchies of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany declared in favor of the permanent expulsion of their respective rulers and for annexation to the kingdom of Sardinia. An assembly in the Romagna,



the papal territory lying north of the Apennines, cast off the government of the Pope and also expressed the wish to be



FIG. 74. GARIBALDI

Garibaldi shares with Victor Emmanuel the national enthusiasm of Italy, and his monument, one of the finest in Rome, looks proudly over the Eternal City from a high hill. He was a republican, a convert of Mazzini, and had lived a restless life, having fought in South America and lived for a time in New York (where his house is preserved as a memorial). At the head of his "legion" of volunteers, clad in their gay red blouses, he was a most picturesque figure, and his rapid success in the south lent an element of romance to the unification of Italy

joined to the kingdom of Sardinia. The customs lines were thereupon abolished between these countries; they adopted the Sardinian constitution and placed their postal service under the control of Sardinian officials. They were therefore of their own accord preparing the way for a united state in northern Italy.

#### 505. Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882).

In southern Italy, on the other hand, the king of Naples stubbornly refused either to form any kind of an alliance with the king of Sardinia or to grant his people a constitution. Garibaldi, who was an ardent disciple of Mazzini, thereupon

determined to bring him to terms and prepare the way for the union of southern Italy and Sicily with the expanding Sardinia. This bold sailor, warrior, and revolutionist accordingly set sail from Genoa for Sicily in May, 1860, on his own responsibility,



8 M.-N. ENG., BUFFALO 10

12 Longitude East 14 from Greenwich 16

**ITALY  
1814-1859**

0 50 100  
Scale of Miles



with a band of a thousand "Red Shirts," as his followers were called from their rough costume. He gained an easy victory over the few troops that the king of the Two Sicilies was able to send against him. He then crossed over to the mainland, and after a slight skirmish he was received in Naples with enthusiasm on September 6.

**506. Napoleon III saves Rome for the Pope.** Garibaldi now proposed to march on Rome and proclaim there the kingdom of Italy. This would have imperiled all the previous gains, for Napoleon III could not, in view of the strong Catholic sentiment in France, possibly permit the occupation of Rome and the destruction of the political independence of the Pope. He agreed that Victor Emmanuel might annex the outlying papal possessions to the north and reestablish a stable government in Naples instead of Garibaldi's dictatorship. But Rome, the imperial city, with the territory immediately surrounding it, must be left to its old master. Victor Emmanuel accordingly marched southward and occupied Naples (October). Its king capitulated, and all southern Italy became a part of the kingdom of Italy.

**507. The First Italian Parliament (1861).** In February, 1861, the first Italian parliament was opened at Turin, and the process of really amalgamating the heterogeneous portions of the new kingdom began. Yet the joy of the Italians over the realization of their hopes of unity and national independence was tempered by the fact that Austria still held one of the most famous of the Italian provinces—Venetia—and that Rome, which typified Italy's former grandeur, was not included in the new kingdom.

### III. THE KINGDOM OF ITALY SINCE 1861

**508. The Pope and Victor Emmanuel.** The fact that Italian unification was not complete did not cause the patriots to lose hope. In a debate in the very first meeting of the new Italian parliament Cavour directed the thoughts and energies of the nation to the recovery of the "Eternal City and the Queen of the Adriatic." Meanwhile, however, Pope Pius IX excommunicated the



king of Sardinia and his ministers and declared the new constitution to be a creation of revolution, a thing to be struck down like a mad dog wherever it showed itself. Furthermore Napoleon III, at the instigation of the French Catholics, sent a French garrison to Rome with a view to protecting the Pope from attack.



MAP OF THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

509. Venice added to the Italian Kingdom (1866). Help, however, soon came from an unexpected quarter. In the early months of 1866 Prussia and Austria were on the eve of war (see next chapter), and in order to gain the support of Italy, Prussia concluded a treaty with Victor Emmanuel in April of that year. When the war came in July the Italians as well as the Prussians attacked Austria. The Italians were worsted in the battle of Custoza, but the Prussians more than made up for this defeat by their memorable victory at Sadowa (§ 529 below). Thereupon Austria consented to cede Venetia to Napoleon III, with the

understanding that he should transfer it to Italy. The efforts of the Italians to wrest Trent and Trieste from Austria failed, however, for their fleet was defeated, and they were forced to content themselves with Venetia, which they owed rather to the victories of others than to their own. The next problem was to win Rome.

#### 510. Rome occupied by Victor Emmanuel (1870).

Four years later, in 1870, when war broke out between France and Prussia (see following chapter), Napoleon III was forced to withdraw the French garrison from Rome, and Victor Emmanuel, having nothing further to fear from French intervention, demanded of Pius IX that he make terms with the kingdom of Italy. The Pope refused; whereupon the Italian troops blew open a gate of the city and without further violence took possession of Rome,



FIG. 75. VICTOR EMMANUEL

while the Pope withdrew to the Vatican palace and proclaimed himself the prisoner of the Italian government. The inhabitants, however, welcomed the invaders; and by a vote of one hundred and thirty thousand to fifteen hundred Rome and the remaining portions of the Papal States were formally annexed to the kingdom of Italy in January, 1871.

Italy was at last free and united from the Alps to the sea, and, as King Victor Emmanuel said at the opening of the parliament of 1871, "It only remains to make our country great and happy." The capital, which had been transferred from Turin to Florence in 1865, was moved to Rome in 1871, and the king made his

solemn entry into the city, announcing to the people, "We are at Rome and we shall remain here." The Sardinian constitution became the constitution of the kingdom of Italy.

**511. The Position of the Pope in Italy.** It was a difficult problem to determine the relations which should exist between the new government and the head of the Christian Church, who for a




FIG. 76. THE PAPAL GARDENS AT THE VATICAN, ROME

These few acres, along with a summer residence which the popes never used, and the two churches of St. Peter and the Lateran in Rome, were all that was left of the temporal sovereignty of the Papacy (see page 283)

thousand years had regarded the city of Rome as his capital. By a law of May, 1871, the Pope was declared to enjoy perfect freedom in all his religious functions, and his person was made sacred and inviolable like that of the king. He was to continue to enjoy the honors and dignity of a sovereign prince and to send and receive diplomatic agents like any other sovereign.

Within the trifling domain which was left to him he might live as an independent ruler, since no officer of the Italian government was to be permitted to enter these precincts on any business of State. In order to indemnify him decently for the loss of his possessions, the Italian government assigned him a little over six



hundred thousand dollars a year from the State treasury. The Pope, however, not only always refused to accept this sum, but he persistently declined to recognize the Italian government and continued to consider himself the prisoner of a power which had unrighteously seized his lands. Early in 1929 an arrangement was reported for settling the problem by slightly increasing the Papal possessions and paying an indemnity for the lost territory.

**512. The Rise of Italy as a Military and Colonial Power.** In order to maintain the dignity of her new position Italy adopted the expensive policy of rapidly increasing her army and navy. Modern warships were constructed, the principle of universal military service was introduced, and the army was reorganized. The building of ships and the equipment of the increased army nearly doubled the military expenses and served to produce a deficit, which amounted in 1887 to \$83,000,000.

**513. Italy joins the Triple Alliance.** Nevertheless, Italy cherished ambitions of expansion and colonial empire. Just across the Mediterranean lay the ancient territory of Carthage, modern Tunis, and from sentimental as well as practical reasons Italy coveted it. But in 1882, before it could act, France seized the land, which bordered on its province of Algeria. This increased Italy's bitterness toward France, and Bismarck used the occasion to win Italy over to sign the famous triple alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary—an alliance which lasted until the great war of 1914.

**514. Italy's Policy in Africa.** Frustrated in northern Africa, the Italians next turned their attention to winning colonial domains in the region of Abyssinia, near the outlet of the Red Sea. An army of occupation was dispatched thither in 1887; and after some fifteen years of intermittent warfare, treaties, negotiations, and massacres of the Italian troops by the natives, the Italians were able to make themselves masters of an area about twice the size of the state of Pennsylvania, inhabited by half a million of nomad peoples. Later the Italians waged war on the Turks for the purpose of securing dominion in northern Africa by the conquest of Tripoli (§ 938 below).



**515. Unredeemed Italy.** Moreover, there was an influential party in Italy which felt that the unification of the country would never be complete until the Italian-speaking populations of the region around Trent, in the great city of Trieste, and along the Dalmatian coast were freed from Austrian rule and incorporated in the new Italian kingdom. These aspirations exercised a decisive influence in drawing Italy into the World War in 1915.

**516. Domestic Progress.** At the same time the Italian kingdom made remarkable progress in domestic affairs. Its industries grew steadily until at the end of the century more than one third of its population was engaged in industrial and commercial pursuits. Its silk, cotton, and woolen mills poured heavy exports into foreign markets, and its business men built up commercial enterprises of the first magnitude. Laws were passed for the improvement of the public schools, and there was a steady reduction in the number of persons over twenty-one who were unable to read and write—from 73 per cent in 1862 to 52 per cent in 1901. By a law of 1895 the suffrage was extended so as to include all adult males who could read and write, possessed a small amount of property, or paid certain taxes.

**517. The Monarchy and Political Parties.** With the progress of democracy the power of the monarchy declined. King Humbert I, who succeeded Victor Emmanuel in 1878, exercised little influence over the conduct of his ministers; but though he reigned without governing he was assassinated by an anarchist in 1900. The son, Victor Emmanuel III, continued the policy of Humbert, leaving the direction of affairs to a ministry responsible to the Italian parliament.

Usually that ministry was composed of a combination of factions, for the country was divided into so many political parties that no one of them could win a majority of the votes. From the early days of the new kingdom there was a small but diminishing number of Republicans. In the election of 1919 they secured only nine seats. A Catholic party that resented the treatment of the Pope and stood for conservatism in politics, and a Liberal party of moderate reformers, ordinarily held the center of the stage, with a rising

group of Socialists and Radicals to dispute their sway. In a word, Italy as an industrial and colonial power was divided in politics along the lines prevailing in both Germany and France.

**518. Economic Distress and Emigration.** She was, moreover, at serious disadvantage in some respects. Being poor in coal, iron,




FIG. 77. MONUMENT TO VICTOR EMMANUEL, AT ROME

On the northwestern slope of the Capitoline Hill the Italians have erected the most imposing monument in Europe, to commemorate the unification of Italy. Its size is indicated in the picture by the relative size of people and buildings. A colossal statue of Victor Emmanuel adorns the center, while a vast colonnade surmounts the hill. The Forum of ancient Rome lies just behind it; but it faces in the opposite direction down a broad, busy street of the modern city, which is growing rapidly. Electric cars now connect the seven hills, and arc lights shine beside the Colosseum.

and other natural resources, she was dependent upon other countries for raw materials. Having a heavy burden of debt and a low per capita ownership of property, her taxes were high and the struggle for existence was bitter. If the number leaving the country be taken as a measure of hard times in Italy, they were severe indeed. In 1888 Italy lost over one hundred thousand subjects; by 1900 the number had increased to three hundred and fifty thousand, and by 1901 to more than half a million.

Unfortunately for her, Italy had no satisfactory colonies to which her people might emigrate and establish themselves in new and fresher surroundings. She had never come into possession of any of those new territories which her venturesome sons, Columbus, Cabot, and Verrazano, had long before laid claim to in the name of other European nations, and her acquisitions in Africa were entirely uninviting to her discontented peasants and workingmen. Those who have left Italy, therefore, have gone to foreign lands—to Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay, while hundreds of thousands have settled in the United States. In 1910, however, no less than 147,000 returned from abroad.

This enormous emigration did not relieve the discontent. In 1905 the strength of the Socialists became so alarming that Pope Pius X instructed faithful Catholics to aid in the struggle against socialism by taking part in the elections, from which they had hitherto been admonished by the Church to abstain.

### QUESTIONS

I. Describe the political condition of Italy in 1850. What were the views of those who desired the unification of Italy? Describe the government of Victor Emmanuel. What was the foreign policy of Cavour?

II. What was the outcome of the participation of Sardinia in the Crimean War? Outline the war waged by Sardinia and France against Austria. What gains were made by Sardinia as a result of this war? Describe the changes which took place in Parma, Modena, Tuscany, and the Romagna in 1859. What part was played by Garibaldi in the unification of Italy? What prevented the complete unification of Italy in 1860? Draw a map of Italy in 1848 showing the chief political divisions. Draw a map of Italy in 1861 showing the changes effected between these two periods.


III. Describe the attitude of Pope Pius IX toward the new Italian kingdom. By what means did the kingdom of Italy gain possession of Venetia in 1866? When and in what way was Rome finally made the capital of Italy? What has been the position of the Pope in Italy since 1871? Describe Italy's colonial policy. Discuss the advantages to Italians of a united Italy. To what is Italian emigration due?

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) Mazzini and Cavour, pp. 115-121; (2) the achievement of unity, pp. 122-136; (3) the attitude of the Pope toward the new order, pp. 130, 136-138; (4) the progress of Italy, pp. 138-141.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Sardinia, Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini, Pius IX, and Victor Emmanuel.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) leaders in Italian unity, pp. 163-170; (2) Napoleon III and the unity of Italy, pp. 170-175. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary Europe*: (3) Italy and the spirit of nationalism, pp. 195-207; (4) Cavour and Italian unity, pp. 207-219.





## CHAPTER XVI

### FORMATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE AND THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN UNION

#### I. PRUSSIA ASSUMES THE LEADERSHIP IN GERMANY


**519. Industrial Revolution in Germany.** The failure to create a strong German state at Frankfort in 1848 (§§ 488-491) was due largely to the tenacity with which the numerous German rulers clung to their sovereignty and independence. However, industry and commerce were silently but surely welding the German people into a nation. In 1835 the first railway line had been built and the era of steam transportation begun; a network of telegraph lines quickly brought the separate states into close and constant touch with one another; and the growth of machine industry compelled them to seek wider markets beyond their borders. A solid foundation for unity was thus laid by steam, electricity, and machinery, and the growth of common business interests.

**520. The Customs Union.** Statesmen as well as leading business men began, shortly after the settlement of 1815, to realize the disastrous effects of the existing division of Germany into numerous independent countries. Each of the thirty-eight states had its own customs line, which cut it off from its German neighbors as well as from foreigners. How this hampered trade can be readily seen by examining the map of Germany at that time. One who traveled in a straight line from Fulda to Altenburg, a distance of some one hundred and twenty-five miles, crossed on the way thirty-four boundary lines and passed through the dominions of nine sovereign and independent monarchs.

In January, 1834, a *Zollverein*, or tariff union, was formed, which was composed of seventeen states with a combined population of twenty-three millions. Goods were allowed to pass freely from

one of these states to another, while the entire group was protected against all outsiders by a common tariff frontier. Austria, after some hesitation, decided not to join this union, but other German states were from time to time compelled by their own interests to do so.

521. **The Policy of William I.** As the center of this commercial reorganization of Germany, Prussia gathered strength for the



THE ZOLLVEREIN

coming conflict with her great rival, Austria, and on the accession of William I, in 1858,<sup>1</sup> a new era dawned for Prussia. The chief aim of the new emperor was to expel Austria from the German confederation, and out of the remaining states to construct a firm union under the leadership of Prussia, which would then take its place among the most powerful nations of Europe. He believed that war must come sooner or later, and therefore made it his first business to develop the military resources of his realms.

<sup>1</sup> He ruled until 1861 as regent for his brother, Frederick William IV, who had become incapacitated by disease.

**522. The Prussian Army Strengthened.** The German army, which owed much of its power to the reforms of William I, later played such a part in the World War that its organization merits attention. Fifty years earlier the necessity of expelling Napoleon had led Prussia to revolutionize the military strength of the kingdom by making military service compulsory for all healthy male citizens, who were to be trained in the standing army and then retired to the reserve, ready to fight if war came. The first thing that William I did was to increase the annual levy from forty to sixty thousand men and to see that all the soldiers remained in active service three years. They then passed into the reserve. William wished to increase the term of service in the reserve from two to four years. In this way the State would claim seven of the years of early manhood and have an effective army of four hundred thousand, which would permit it to dispense with the service of those who were approaching middle life. The lower house of the Prussian parliament refused, however, to make the necessary appropriations for thus increasing the strength of the army.

**523. Bismarck's Purpose to Prussianize Germany.** The king proceeded, nevertheless, with his plan, and in 1862 summoned to his side a Prussian statesman who would carry out that plan despite all opposition. Otto von Bismarck was a Prussian of the Prussians. He dedicated his great abilities to the one supreme object of Prussianizing all Germany,—and with such success that his country became so powerful that it was able, when the World War came, to long withstand its many enemies. Bismarck firmly believed in the divine right of the Hohenzollerns; he hated parliaments and freely displayed his contempt for the ideas of the Liberal party, which had attempted to unify Germany in 1848. He had every confidence in war—in the mailed fist and shining sword, by which he foresaw he must gain his ends. He belonged to the highly conservative class of Prussian landed proprietors, successors to the former manorial lords (§ 339)—the so-called Junkers—the same group who had so much to do with advocating and prolonging the war of 1914. To accomplish his purposes Prussia fought three

wars, and prepared the way for a fourth, which after his death involved the whole globe.

**524. Bismarck's Plans for Prussian Dominance.** In order to raise Prussia to the position of a dominating European power Bismarck perceived that four things were essential: (1) the Prussian army must be greatly strengthened, for without that he could not hope to carry out his audacious program; (2) Austria, hitherto so influential in German affairs, must be pushed out of Germany altogether, leaving the field to Prussia; (3) Prussian territory must be enlarged and consolidated through the annexation of those German states that separated the eastern possessions of the Hohenzollerns from the Rhine districts; (4) and, lastly, the large South German states, which disliked Prussia and suspected her mo-



FIG. 78. BISMARCK

tives, must in some way be induced to join a union under her headship. The task seemed hopeless, for attempts to consolidate Germany had failed from the times of Otto the Great (Vol. I, § 584) down to those of William I. Nevertheless, within ten years Bismarck had, by a combination of diplomacy, patience, and violence, succeeded in uniting Germany under the Hohenzollerns.

**525. Bismarck overrides the Prussian Parliament.** The first obstacle Bismarck encountered was the refusal of the lower house of the Prussian parliament to grant the money necessary for increasing the army. But Bismarck was not the man to be stopped. In defiance of the lower house and of the newspapers he carried on the strengthening of the army without formal appropriations



by parliament, on the theory that the constitution had made no provision in case of a deadlock between the upper and lower houses and that consequently the king, in such a case, might exercise his former absolute power.

In one of his first speeches in parliament Bismarck said with brutal frankness, "The great questions of the time are to be decided not by speeches and votes of majorities, but by blood and iron." For a time it seemed as if Prussia was returning to a pure despotism, for there was assuredly no more fundamental provision of the constitution than the right of the people to control the granting of the taxes. Yet after Bismarck had succeeded in his policy of "blood and iron," he was eventually fully forgiven by the Germans, on the ground that the end had justified the means.

**526. The Schleswig-Holstein Affair.** Prussia now had a military force sufficient to encourage hope of victory should she undertake a war with her old rival. In order to bring about the expulsion of Austria from the Confederation, Bismarck took advantage of a knotty problem that had been troubling Germany, known as the Schleswig-Holstein affair. The provinces of Schleswig and Holstein, although inhabited largely by Germans, had for centuries belonged to the king of Denmark. They were not considered a part of Denmark, however, any more than Hanover had been a part of Great Britain. But in 1847 the king of Denmark proclaimed that he was going to incorporate these provinces into the Danish kingdom in spite of the large proportion of Germans in the population. This aroused great indignation throughout Germany. The controversy over the relation of these provinces to Denmark continued, and finally, in 1863, just after Bismarck's accession to power, Schleswig was definitely united with the Danish kingdom.

**527. The Victory over Denmark (1864).** Bismarck saw a way of settling the whole matter by annexing the Danish provinces to his dear Prussia and at the same time securing an excuse for a fight with Austria, for which he now felt himself ready. His first step was politely to ask Austria to coöperate with Prussia in an effort to settle the question of the provinces. The king of

Denmark refused to make any concessions, and so the two great German powers declared war on him (February, 1864). The little Danish army was no match for them, and a few months later Denmark ceded the duchies to Austria and Prussia. They were to make such disposition of the provinces as they saw fit. Bismarck did everything to prevent any permanent arrangement, for he was anxious to fall out with Austria and at the same time get both the Danish provinces for Prussia. He boldly began to turn Kiel, on the Baltic coast of Holstein, into a Prussian naval station, and did all in his power to irritate Austria.<sup>1</sup>

## II. THE WAR OF 1866 AND THE FORMATION OF THE NORTH GERMAN FEDERATION

**528. The German Confederation Dissolved.** In April, 1866, Bismarck made a treaty with Italy that, should the king of Prussia take up arms during the following three months, it too would immediately declare war on Austria, with the hope, of course, of obtaining Venetia (§ 509). The relations between Austria and Prussia grew more and more strained, until finally, in June, 1866, Austria was compelled to call out the forces of the German Confederation to protect herself against Prussia. Prussia's representative in the diet declared that this act put an end to the existing German union.

**529. War between Austria and Prussia; Battle of Sadowa.** On June 14 Prussia formally declared war on Austria. With the exception of Mecklenburg and the small states of the north, all Germany sided with Austria against Prussia. Bismarck immediately demanded that the rulers of the larger North German states—Hanover, Saxony, and Hesse-Cassel—should stop their warlike

<sup>1</sup> Prussia definitely annexed the provinces in 1866. Later the Germans built a canal across Holstein from Kiel to the mouth of the Elbe and so connected the two stretches of German coast which are separated by the Danish peninsula. The Danes of northern Schleswig were promised the right to say whether or no they desired to be united with Denmark. But Prussia paid no attention to this pledge, and these Danes sent to the German parliament a deputy who took every opportunity to protest against the ugly efforts of the Prussian government to compel them to adopt the German language. The matter was left to be settled after the World War.

preparations and agree to accept Prussia's plan of reform. On their refusal, Prussian troops immediately occupied these territories and war actually began.

The Prussian army promptly prevented all resistance on the part of the states of the north; Austria was miserably defeated on July 3, 1866, in the decisive battle of Königgrätz, or Sadowa,



GERMAN STATES SEIZED BY PRUSSIA IN 1866

and within three weeks after the breaking of diplomatic relations the war was practically over. Austria's influence was at an end, and Prussia was in a position to dictate to the rest of Germany.

**530. The North German Federation.** Prussia was aware that the larger states south of the river Main were not ripe for the union that she desired. She therefore organized a so-called North German Federation, which included all the states north of the Main. Prussia had seized the opportunity to increase considerably her own boundaries and round out her territory by annexing the North German states (with the exception of Saxony) which had opposed her in the war. Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and

the free city of Frankfurt, along with the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, all were added to the kingdom of the Hohenzollerns.

**531. Requirements of the Proposed Constitution.** Prussia, thus enlarged, summoned the lesser states about her to confer upon a constitution that should accomplish three ends. First, it must give to all the people of the territory included in the new union, regardless of the particular state in which they lived, a voice in the government. A democratic assembly satisfied this demand. Secondly, the predominating position of Prussia must be secured; but at the same time, thirdly, the self-respect of the other monarchs whose lands were included must not be sacrificed. The king of Prussia was therefore made "president" of the federation but not its sovereign. The chief governing body was the Federal Council (*Bundesrat*). In this each ruler, however small his state, and each of the three free towns—Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck—had at least one vote; thus it was arranged that the other rulers should not become *subjects* of the king of Prussia. The real sovereign of the North German Federation was not the king of Prussia, but "all of the united governments." At the same time, by distributing the votes as in the old diet, Prussia, including the territory she seized in 1866, enjoyed seventeen votes out of forty-three. Moreover, Prussia could count upon the support of some of the lesser states. Lastly, the constitution was so arranged that when the time came for the southern states—Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and South Hesse—to join the union, there would be little need of change.

### III. THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE

**532. Foreign Policy of Napoleon III.** No one was more chagrined by the abrupt termination of the war of 1866 and the victory of Prussia than Napoleon III. He had hoped that both Prussia and Austria might be weakened by a long struggle, and that he might have a chance to settle matters so as to gain something for France, as had happened after the Italian war.



His disappointment was the more keen because he was troubled at home by the demands of the liberals for reform, and had recently suffered a loss of prestige among his people by the failure of a plan for getting a foothold in Mexico,<sup>1</sup> Napoleon was further troubled by his failure to secure the grand duchy of Luxemburg, which its sovereign, the king of Holland, would have sold to him if it had not been for the intervention of Prussia. In other ways also it was believed that Napoleon had been outwitted by Bismarck, and a war fever developed both in France and in Germany, which was fostered by the sensational press of Paris and Berlin. Frenchmen began to talk about "avenging Sadowa," and the Prussians to threaten their "hereditary enemy" with summary treatment for past wrongs.

**533. The Dispute over the Spanish Succession.** In the midst of this irritation a pretext for war was afforded by the question of the Spanish throne, then vacant as the result of the expulsion of Queen Isabella in 1868. After the flight of the queen a national Cortes was summoned to determine upon a form of government, and after long deliberations it finally tendered the crown to Leopold of Hohenzollern, a distant relative of William I

<sup>1</sup> This Mexican episode is one of the most curious incidents in the checkered career of Napoleon III. He desired to see the Latin peoples of the western world develop into strong nations to offset the preponderance of the Anglo-Saxons in North America; and furthermore, like his uncle, he cherished imperial designs outside of the confines of Europe. What appeared to him to be an excellent opportunity to build up a Latin empire under his protection was afforded by disorders in Mexico. In the summer of 1861, at the opening of the great Civil War in America, the republic of Mexico suspended payments on its debts. England, France, and Spain made a joint demonstration against Mexico in favor of their subjects who held Mexican bonds. Napoleon then entered into negotiations with some Mexicans who wanted to overthrow the republic, and he offered to support the establishment of an empire if they would choose as their ruler Archduke Maximilian, brother of the Austrian emperor, to which they agreed. Little realizing how few of the Mexican people wanted him for their ruler, Maximilian landed in his new realm in 1864, strongly supported by French troops. As soon as the Civil War in the United States was brought to a close, the American government protested, in the name of the Monroe Doctrine, against foreign intervention in Mexican affairs, and as Napoleon III was in no position to wage war with so formidable a power, he withdrew his soldiers and advised Maximilian to abdicate and return to Europe. The new emperor, however, refused to leave Mexico, and shortly afterwards he was captured and shot (June, 1867). The whole affair cost France a great deal of money and the lives of many soldiers, and discredited Napoleon's ability as a statesman.

of Prussia. This greatly excited the newspaper men of Paris, who loudly protested that it was only an indirect way of bringing Spain under the influence of Prussia. The French minister of foreign affairs declared that the candidacy was an attempt to reëstablish the empire of Charles V (Vol. I, § 721). This belief was unfounded, for, in spite of the apprehensions of the French, the mass of the Spanish people were more anxious to see the restoration of the Bourbon line in the person of Alfonso, the son of Queen Isabella, than they were to have as their ruler Leopold of Hohenzollern, or Amadeus (the son of the king of Italy), who was finally induced in 1870 to accept the crown.<sup>1</sup>

But the war parties in France and Prussia were looking for a pretext for a conflict, and consequently the candidacy of Prince Leopold was given an exaggerated importance. In June, 1870, with the consent of the king of Prussia, Leopold accepted the proffered crown; but when the French government protested he withdrew his acceptance, also with the approbation of the Prussian king.

**534. War between France and Prussia (July, 1870).** The affair now seemed to be closed, but the French ministry was not satisfied with the outcome and demanded that the king of Prussia should pledge himself that the candidacy should never be renewed. This William refused to do, and Bismarck, anxious both to force a war and to throw the blame for it upon the French, so worded the account given to the German newspapers of the refusal as to make it appear that the French ambassador had insulted King William and had been rebuffed. This excited the "jingoës" in both countries to a state of frenzy, and although the war party

<sup>1</sup> Amadeus was an enlightened prince and endeavored to rule according to the wishes of his new subjects. But wearied by the conflicting parties in Spain, after a little more than two years' experience, Amadeus laid down his crown, and the revolutionists proclaimed a republic (February 12, 1873), which lasted only about a year. At last, in 1875, the crown was given to Isabella's son, who took the title of Alfonso XII, and after a short civil war a new constitution was drawn up in 1876 providing for a parliament of two houses — a senate composed of grandees, appointed dignitaries, and elected persons, and a lower house of representatives chosen by popular suffrage. (By the electoral law of 1890 all male Spaniards twenty-five years of age were entitled to vote.) Alfonso XII died in 1885 and was succeeded by Alfonso XIII, who was born a few months after his father's death.

in France was a small minority, that country nevertheless recklessly declared war against Prussia on July 19, 1870.

**535. Disastrous Opening of the War for France.** The French minister proclaimed that he entered the conflict with a "light heart," but it was not long before he realized the folly of the headlong plunge. The hostility which the South German states had hitherto shown toward Prussia had encouraged Napoleon III to believe that as soon as the French troops should gain their first victory, Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden would join him. But that first victory was never won. War had no sooner been declared than the South as well as the North Germans ranged themselves as a nation against a foreign enemy. The French army, moreover, was neither well equipped nor well commanded. The Germans hastened across the Rhine and within a few days were driving the French before them. In a series of bloody encounters about Metz one of the French armies was defeated and finally shut up within the fortifications of the town. Seven weeks had not elapsed after the beginning of the war before the Germans had captured a second French army and made a prisoner of the emperor himself in the great battle of Sedan, September 1, 1870.

**536. Siege of Paris and End of the War.** The Germans then surrounded and laid siege to Paris. Napoleon III had been completely discredited by the disasters about Metz and Sedan, and consequently the empire was abolished and France for the third time was declared a republic. In spite of the energy which the new government showed in arousing the nation against the invaders, prolonged resistance was impossible. The capital surrendered on January 28, 1871, after a memorable siege, and an armistice was concluded.

**537. Cession of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany.** In arranging the terms of peace, their easy victory led the Germans to take an action for which they had to pay in the war of 1914. When Bismarck concluded the war with Austria he wisely took precautions to leave as little bitterness behind as possible. With France it was different. The Germans wished a visible sign that they had had their revenge. They forced the French to cede to

them two provinces—Alsace and northeastern Lorraine.<sup>1</sup> In this way France was cut off from “the German Rhine,” and the crest of the Vosges Mountains became the frontier. Many of the Alsatians, it is true, spoke a German dialect, but few had any desire to become a part of the German Empire. The people felt themselves to be an integral part of the French nation, and rather than submit to the hated rule of the Germans many of them left their homes and settled in France. Those who remained never ceased to protest against the harsh attempts of the German government to prevent criticism and expressions of discontent.

**538. The Indemnity.** The Germans exacted a heavy war indemnity from France—a billion dollars—and proclaimed that German troops would remain in France until the sum was paid. The French people made pathetic sacrifices to hasten the payment of the indemnity in order to free their country from the presence of the detested “Prussians.” The bitter feeling between France and Germany dates from this war. The natural longing of the French for their “lost provinces,” and the suspicions of the Germans, not only prevented the nations from becoming friends but had much to do with the sudden and disastrous attack which Germany made on France in August, 1914. The fate of Alsace-Lorraine was from the first one of the crucial issues of the World War, and was settled at the peace table in favor of France.

**539. Proclamation of the German Empire (January 18, 1871).** As Bismarck had hoped, the successful war against France completed his work, begun in 1866, of creating a German empire. The southern states,—Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and South Hesse,—having sent their troops to fight side by side with the Prussian forces, consented, after their common victory over France, to join the North German Federation. By a series of treaties it was agreed, among other things, that the name “North German

<sup>1</sup> Alsace had, with certain reservations,—especially as regarded Strasbourg and the other free towns,—been ceded to the French king by the treaty of Westphalia at the close of the Thirty Years' War (Vol. I, § 817). During the reign of Louis XIV all of Alsace had been annexed to France (1681). The duchy of Lorraine had fallen to France in 1766, upon the death of its last duke. It had previously been regarded as a part of the Holy Roman Empire. The part of Lorraine demanded by Germany in 1871 included about one third of the original duchy, including the fortified city of Metz.



Federation" should give way to that of "German Empire," and that the king of Prussia, as president of the union, should be given the title of "German Emperor." Surrounded by German princes, William, king of Prussia and president of the North German Federation, was proclaimed German Emperor in the former palace of the French kings at Versailles, January 18, 1871.



FIG. 79. PROCLAMATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE

The Germans selected the palace of Louis XIV at Versailles as the place in which to proclaim their new empire under the headship of the House of Hohenzollern. Forty-eight years later the emperor of Germany was a fugitive, his empire a socialistic republic, and German delegates were signing in this very "Hall of Mirrors" a far more humiliating peace than that imposed on France in 1871

540. Relation of the Franco-Prussian War to the World War. French politicians and newspaper men certainly played into Germany's hands when, unaware of Germany's strength and little realizing France's military weakness, they urged a declaration of war against their neighbor. France had to pay for this terrible mistake by losing her provinces and watching Germany increase in

population and wealth until Prussian confidence reached such a point that, forty-three years later, the German armies once more swept into France. In 1870 Europe and the United States observed strict neutrality during the conflict. In 1914, on the contrary, the conduct of Germany speedily aroused the hostility of most of the other nations of the world, and they gradually formed a gigantic combination against her and her allies.

X

#### IV. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY AFTER 1866

**541. The Austro-Hungarian Dualism (1867).** The defeat at Sadowa and the formation of the North German Federation served to cut off Austria from Germany altogether, and she was left to solve the problems of adjusting her relations with Hungary, reconciling the claims of the various races within her borders, and meeting the demands for constitutional government and reforms.

Soon after the defeat of Austria by Prussia in 1866 the relations between the Austrian Empire and the kingdom of Hungary were finally settled by a compromise. Francis Joseph agreed to regard himself as ruling over two separate and practically independent states: (1) the Austrian Empire, which included seventeen provinces,—Upper and Lower Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Carinthia, Carniola, and the rest; and (2) the kingdom of Hungary, including Croatia and Slavonia. While each of these had its own constitution and its own parliament, one at Vienna and the other at Pesth, and managed its own affairs under the guidance of its own ministers, the two governments, in dealing with foreign nations, declaring war, and concluding treaties, were to appear as one state, to be called Austria-Hungary. They were to have a common army and navy and to be united commercially by using the same coins, weights, and measures and agreeing upon a common tariff. There was a curious kind of joint parliament (made up of delegates chosen by the Austrian and Hungarian legislatures) to manage the affairs of this double state. Although this particular kind of union between two states was a new thing in Europe, it proved to be strong enough to last until 1918.

**542. The Old Race Questions.** The problem of satisfying the various races, with their differing languages and their national aspirations, was the most serious difficulty which both Austria and Hungary had to face, and which they never solved. In 1867 there were in Austria 7,100,000 Germans, 4,700,000 Czechs, 2,440,000 Poles (in Galicia), 2,580,000 Ruthenians (in eastern Galicia), 1,190,000 Slovenes (principally in Carinola), 520,000 Croats (in Dalmatia and Istria), 580,000 Italians (in Trieste and southern Tyrol), and 200,000 Rumanians (in Bukowina).<sup>1</sup> The Germans held that the German town of Vienna, the old seat of the court, was the natural center of all the provinces, and that the German language, since it was spoken more generally than any other in the Austrian provinces and was widely used in scientific and literary works, should be given the preference everywhere by the government. The Czechs and Poles, on their part, longed for their old freedom and independence, wished to use their own language, and constantly permitted their dislike of the Germans to influence their policy in the parliament at Vienna.

**543. Reduction in the Power of the Church in Austria.** In 1868 the Liberal party forced through the Austrian parliament laws which restricted the time-honored prerogatives of the Catholic clergy. Every individual was given the right to choose his own religion and to worship as he pleased. Government offices and positions in the schools were thrown open to all citizens, regardless of creed; the State, not the Church, was thereafter to manage the schools; civil marriage was instituted for those who did not wish to have a priest officiate at their marriage, as well as for those whom the priests refused to unite. The Pope protested and declared the laws of 1868 null and void. Nevertheless the reforms which Joseph II had striven to introduce before the French Revolution (§ 156) were at last secured.

**544. Magyar Predominance in Hungary.** The Magyars were more successful than the Germans in maintaining their supremacy. The population of Hungary proper in 1911 was about eighteen

<sup>1</sup> See accompanying map.







THE MATTHEWS-NORTHROP WORKS


from Greenwich 20° 22° 24° 26° 28°



# AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

1867-1918

SCALE OF MILES



20° 22° 24° 26°



millions, of which the Magyars formed something over half. Croatia and Slavonia had together slightly more than two and a half millions. There were also some Serbians ; to the east were Rumanians, subjects of Hungary, and to the north the Slovaks. In the lower house of the diet four hundred and thirteen deputies were chosen in Hungary and only forty in Croatia and Slavonia. Magyar was naturally the language chiefly used in the diet, and by government officials and railway employees, and in the universities. The government encouraged the migration of the people



FIG. 80. FARMING SCENE IN HUNGARY

Farm implements made by American firms were introduced on the vast plains of Hungary, where they were drawn by the long-horned cattle. The peasants continued to dress in the old costume of the manor, and the men's kilts looked much like women's skirts

to the cities, especially to Pesh, for it was the rapidly growing cities which were the strongholds of the Magyars, and the number of those who spoke their language was steadily increasing.

Croatia and Slavonia were dissatisfied with the way they were treated in the national parliament. The Serbians were discontented, and some of them cherished the hope that the region they inhabited would be annexed some day to the kingdom of Serbia ; while the Rumanians looked longingly to the independent kingdom of Rumania, of which they felt they should form a part. This racial discontent contributed to the causes leading to the World War of 1914 and to the final disruption of the Hungarian monarchy in 1918.



**545. Growth of the Power of the United States.** During the period we have been discussing, the United States was growing into a world power. By the purchase of the vast Louisiana territory from Napoleon in 1803 (§ 286), the annexation of Texas in 1845, and the addition of an extensive domain after the close of the Mexican war in 1848, the boundaries of the United States had been greatly enlarged and extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The population had increased from three and a half millions at the close of the Revolution to over thirty millions in 1860.

Like Germany and Italy it had a problem of unification, as the result of the drifting apart of the North, with its factories and interest in a protective tariff, and the South, with its extensive plantations cultivated by slave labor. While Metternich was worrying over revolutionary movements in Spain and Italy, Congress was working out the Missouri Compromise. In 1820 Missouri was admitted to the union as a slave state and Maine as a free state. The Louisiana territory was divided into free and slave regions. Just after the revolutionary movements of 1830 war was threatened in the United States by South Carolina's "nullification" of a tariff law which it deemed adverse to its interests, and another compromise was necessary.

In 1850, two years after the great upheaval in Europe, there came another crisis—this time over slavery in the new territories acquired from Mexico. Once more a compromise was agreed upon.

This settlement proved to be a failure, and the country drifted into civil war. In 1854 Congress, by the Kansas-Nebraska Act, expressly repealed the Missouri Compromise. Three years later came the Dred Scott decision, by which the Supreme Court of the United States declared that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the territories. In 1859 John Brown invaded Virginia with a small armed band and tried to raise a slave insurrection. The next year Abraham Lincoln was elected president on a platform declaring against slavery in the territories.

**546. The Civil War (1861-1865).** Secession and the Civil War ensued. In that conflict both the North and the South appealed

especially to England and France for aid, and the fate of this nation hung upon the policies of the British ministers and Napoleon III. Had they interfered, as they threatened to do, on behalf of the South, the American Union might have been disrupted.

The Civil War seemed to prove that states would not be permitted to withdraw from the Union. Slavery was abolished. The Federal constitution was amended so as to grant the rights of citizenship to the former slaves. The Southern states were restored to the Union. The Southern whites were driven into a compact body, known as "the solid South," and a grave question of the position of the negroes was forced upon the attention of the country. Meanwhile American industries flourished, and the United States, once merely a heavy buyer in European markets, began to seek business in every quarter of the globe.

### QUESTIONS

I. What was the effect of the Industrial Revolution upon the German states? Describe the *Zollverein* of 1834. By what means was Prussia enabled to assume the leadership of the German states? Describe the way in which the Prussian army was strengthened. Give an account of Bismarck's views and aims.

II. What use did Bismarck make of the Schleswig-Holstein question? Show on a map the position taken by the different German states in the Austro-German war of 1866. Trace on a map the extent of the North German Federation, indicating the gains made by Prussia as a result of the war with Austria. What were the chief features of the constitution of the North German Federation?

III. Describe the foreign policy of Napoleon III. Describe the situation which led to the war between France and Prussia in 1870. Outline the main events of this war. What were the terms of peace? Discuss the effect of this war upon German unity.

IV. Describe the government established for Austria-Hungary in 1867. What religious reforms were introduced in Austria? What were the racial problems of Austria? How did the Magyars strive to keep their predominance in Hungary? Trace the outline of the struggle for unity in the United States, 1820-1865.

## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) Bismarck's policy in Prussia, pp. 142-144; (2) the war with Austria and the North German Confederation, pp. 144-155; (3) attitude of Napoleon III toward Germany, pp. 155-157; (4) the war with France and the formation of the German Empire, pp. 158-165; (5) Austria-Hungary after 1866, pp. 165-175.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: William I (of Prussia), Bismarck, Hellmuth von Moltke, Albrecht von Roon, Schleswig-Holstein, Seven Weeks' War, Franco-Prussian War, Maximilian (Emperor of Mexico), and Napoleon III (especially his foreign policies).

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) Prussian leadership in Germany, pp. 180-195; (2) the rivalry of France and Germany, pp. 195-206. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary Europe*: (3) Prussia and Bismarck, pp. 169-179; (4) the Seven Weeks' War, pp. 179-184; (5) the Franco-Prussian War, pp. 184-194.

# BOOK V. REFORM IN EUROPE BEFORE THE WORLD WAR

## CHAPTER XVII

### THE GERMAN EMPIRE (1871-1918)

#### I. THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION

547. How the German Constitution became of World Interest. Few persons outside of Germany knew much about the German constitution and methods of government before the opening of the World War in 1914. Then suddenly these became a matter of world-wide interest. The ravaging of a helpless, blameless little nation like Belgium, with no further excuse than that it suited the interests of the German high military command to pass through that country in order to crush France, woke other nations to the dangers that lurked in the German system.

When, in April, 1917, the policy of the German military authorities finally forced the United States into the war, President Wilson explained to Congress that Germany had "an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck"; that "the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friend"; that, with its control of the German military machine, it was the "natural foe to liberty"; that "no autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith"; and that since the German Empire had become a menace to the peace and freedom of the world, the United States should combine with other democratic nations against it and, if necessary, "spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power." Although the World War put an end to autocracy in Germany, the old system should be carefully studied.



**548. Prussian Origin of the German Constitution.** In the previous chapter the origin of the German Empire was described. Its constitution was originally drawn up after Prussia defeated Austria in 1866 and was designed to secure Prussian predominance in Germany (§§ 530–531 and 539). Even if some little influence was granted to the representatives of the people, we might be sure that Bismarck, with his autocratic ideas and his confidence in kings and armies, would not consent to any essential weakening of the monarch's power or of the control enjoyed by the military and landowning classes (Junkers).

In the North German Federation of 1866 Prussia, with the German states she had seized, constituted nearly the whole union. In spite of the addition of the states south of the Main River in 1870–1871, Prussia still formed nearly two thirds of the empire, and her citizens amounted to nearly two thirds of the population of Germany.

**549. The Prussian Constitution of 1850.** So before considering the constitution of the empire, we must see the nature of the Prussian government under which a majority of the Germans lived—a government that existed until it was overthrown at the end of the World War, in 1918. When, in 1850, the king of Prussia “granted” his people a constitution (§ 492), Bismarck heartily opposed the measure; and when, as we have seen, in 1862, he decided that the army must be increased he paid no attention to the refusal of the Prussian lower house to grant him the necessary money (§ 525). The militaristic landowning class were in control of the upper house of the Prussian parliament, or diet. The method of electing members to the lower house was so arranged as to give the richer classes an overwhelming influence.

**550. The “Three-Class System” of Voting.** The members of the lower house were elected *indirectly*; that is, by conventions, the delegates to which were chosen in each electoral district. Every man who had reached the age of twenty-five years was permitted to vote, but care was taken that if he were poor his vote should count for practically nothing. This was managed by dividing the voters into three classes, according to the amount of

taxes they paid. Those who were richest and together paid a third of the taxes had a third of the votes; those who paid the second third had a third; and, finally, the great mass of the people, who made up the other third, had a right to select a third of the deputies to the electoral convention, which met to select representatives of the district to sit in the diet.

**551. The Dominance of the King and the Junkers.** Sometimes it happened that a single rich Junker, or even a single Berlin manufacturer, might elect a third of the delegates in his district. In 1900 the Social Democrats cast a majority of votes for members of the electoral conventions and found themselves with only seven seats in the Prussian diet out of nearly four hundred, the rest having been filled by the richer, conservative classes. But not satisfied with the workings of the "three-class system," the Prussian government made everyone vote aloud, so that the government officials could tell what his sentiments were.

**552. Powerlessness of the Lower House.** Even when the lower house got together, it had little power. The king was in control of the upper house, the members of which were elected as he wished. He initiated all laws and had an absolute veto on all measures passed by the parliament. The members of the lower house could talk in any strain they thought prudent, and could refuse to approve appropriations; but there were various forms of pressure that could be brought to bear on them to support the king and his advisers. We must now turn to the Federal constitution and note the ingenious manner in which the control of Prussia and its king was extended over the whole empire.

**553. Position of the German Emperor.** It will be remembered that the constitution of the North German Federation had been drawn up with the hope that the South German states would consent in time to join this union which Prussia arranged in 1866. Consequently, when the German Empire was proclaimed, four years later, fewer changes needed to be made than might have been expected. The ancient title "German Emperor" (*Deutscher Kaiser*) was bestowed on King William I of Prussia and his successors on the throne of the Hohenzollerns. He was not, however,

regarded as the *sovereign* of Germany, for this would have offended the pride of the various German kings and princes, like the kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg, who would not consent to be subkings under the chief king of Prussia. So the kaiser was only given the "presidency" of the empire. It is true that William II was accustomed to talk as if he ruled Germany, as well as Prussia, by the grace of God, but he had no constitutional right to make this claim.

**554. Powers of the Kaiser.** The emperor did not have the right directly to veto the measures passed by the imperial parliament, but he exercised many of the powers that would fall to an absolute monarch. He appointed and dismissed the chancellor of the empire, who, with his "all-highest" self, was the chief official spokesman of Germany. What was most dangerous for the rest of the world, the kaiser commanded the unconditional obedience of all German soldiers and sailors and appointed the chief officers in the army and navy. He had only to say that the Fatherland was attacked and he could hurl the German army against any of its neighbors he chose without asking the nation's approval. This he did when he ordered the invasion of Belgium and France in 1914.

**555. The Bundesrat.** The sovereignty of the empire was theoretically vested not in the kaiser but in a sort of composite monarch called the Federal Council (*Bundesrat*), the most peculiar, important, and least understood feature of the German system. This was made up of the representatives of the twenty-two monarchs and of the three free cities included in the federation. They had to vote as their rulers commanded rather than as the people of their respective states might desire. The king of Prussia had seventeen votes, to which he added the three assigned to Alsace-Lorraine, which he controlled; this insured him twenty out of a total of sixty-one. The king of Bavaria had six, the ruler of Saxony four, the ruler of Würtemberg four, and a great part of the smaller countries only one.

**556. The Reichstag.** The democratic element in the government was the *Reichstag*, or House of Representatives, which consisted of about four hundred members distributed among the

various states according to their population.<sup>1</sup> The constitution provided that every German citizen twenty-five years of age might vote for members of the Reichstag. The representatives were elected for a term of five years, but the house might at any time be dissolved by the emperor with the consent of the Bundesrat. Members of the Reichstag, under a law of May, 1906, were paid for their services.

**557. The Chancellor as an Imperial Agent.** The chief minister of the empire was the chancellor, who was appointed by the kaiser and might be dismissed by him at will. The chancellor was not bound by any resolutions or votes of the Reichstag; he was entirely at the command of the emperor, from whom alone he derived his authority. He presided over the Bundesrat, appointed the federal officers in the name of the emperor, and supervised the discharge of their duties.

1 COMPOSITION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE

| NAMES OF THE STATES                                      | POPULATION<br>DEC. 1, 1910<br>(IN ROUND<br>NUMBERS) | NUMBER OF<br>MEMBERS<br>IN THE<br>BUNDES-<br>RAT | PRESENT NUM-<br>BER OF REPRE-<br>SENTATIVES<br>IN THE<br>REICHSTAG |
|--|---|--|--|
| Kingdom of Prussia . . . . .                             | 40,100,000  | 17   | 236  |
| Kingdom of Bavaria . . . . .                             | 6,800,000   | 6  | 43   |
| Kingdom of Saxony . . . . .                              | 4,800,000   | 4  | 23   |
| Kingdom of Württemberg . . . . .                         | 2,400,000   | 4  | 17   |
| Grandduchy of Baden . . . . .                            | 2,100,000   | 3  | 14   |
| Grandduchy of Hesse . . . . .                            | 1,200,000   | 3  | 9  |
| Grandduchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin . . . . .             | 639,000   | 2  | 6  |
| Grandduchy of Saxe-Weimar . . . . .                      | 417,000   | 1  | 3  |
| Grandduchy of Mecklenburg-Strelitz . . . . .             | 106,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Grandduchy of Oldenburg . . . . .                        | 482,000   | 1  | 3  |
| Duchy of Brunswick . . . . .                             | 494,000   | 2  | 3  |
| Duchy of Saxe-Meiningen . . . . .                        | 278,000   | 1  | 2  |
| Duchy of Saxe-Altenburg . . . . .                        | 216,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Duchy of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha . . . . .                     | 257,000   | 1  | 2  |
| Duchy of Anhalt . . . . .                                | 331,000   | 1  | 2  |
| Principality of Schwarzburg-Sonders-<br>hausen . . . . . | 89,000  | 1  | 1  |
| Principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt . . . . .         | 100,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Principality of Waldeck . . . . .                        | 61,000  | 1  | 1  |
| Principality of Reuss, elder line . . . . .              | 72,000  | 1  | 1  |
| Principality of Reuss, junior line . . . . .             | 152,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Principality of Schaumburg-Lippe . . . . .               | 46,000  | 1  | 1  |
| Principality of Lippe . . . . .                          | 150,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Free town of Lübeck . . . . .                            | 116,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Free town of Bremen . . . . .                            | 298,000   | 1  | 1  |
| Free town of Hamburg . . . . .                           | 1,015,000   | 1  | 3  |
| Imperial territory of Alsace-Lorraine . . . . .          | 1,800,000   | 3  | 15   |
| <b>Total (details added) . . . . .</b>                   | <b>64,903,423</b>                                   | <b>61</b>  | <b>397</b>   |



In short, Germany had never introduced "ministerial responsibility,"—the system of holding the ruler's ministers responsible to the parliament,—which prevailed in other European countries. The kaiser exercised, through the chancellor and in view of his position as king of Prussia, a power unrivaled by any of the constitutional rulers of Europe, and the Reichstag served rather as a critic of, and a check on, the government than as the directing force.




FIG. 81. PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, BERLIN

**558. Welding the Nation together by Legislation.** When German unity was finally achieved in 1871 its permanence was by no means assured. The various German rulers were zealous in safeguarding their own particular rights, and they were not altogether pleased with the preëminence assumed by the king of Prussia. Each state had its own traditions of independence, its own peculiar industrial interests, and its own particular form of government. Realizing the strength of these local tendencies, the imperial government undertook to establish stronger national ties through the introduction of uniform laws for the whole German people, to supplant the diverse laws of the various states.

**559. Introduction of Uniform Laws.** The leadership in this nationalizing movement fell naturally to Bismarck, chancellor of

the empire and president of the Prussian ministry. The imperial parliament was given the power to regulate commerce and intercourse between the states and with foreign nations, to coin money, to fix weights and measures, and to control the banking system, railways, telegraph, and post office, besides other general powers. But, more than this, the Federal government in Germany was empowered to make uniform throughout the empire the criminal and civil law and the organization of the courts. Consequently the Prussian chancellor, as the kaiser's representative, could proceed to direct the reform of all Germany according to his ideas of what was best for her.

The parliament at once set to work to exercise the important powers conferred upon it. In 1873 a uniform currency law was passed, and the bewildering variety of coins and paper notes of the separate states was replaced by a simple system of which the *mark* (then about twenty-five cents) was the basis. The new coins bore on one side the effigy of the emperor and on the other the arms of the empire, "to preach to the people the good news of unity." Gradually uniform laws were drawn up for the whole empire, and uniform methods of trying cases were worked out and established.

**560. Origin of the Catholic Party, or *Center*.** Bismarck was troubled by the opposition of the Catholic representatives from South Germany and the Rhine districts, who feared the supremacy of Protestant Prussia. For a time the chancellor tried harsh measures, but he only succeeded in strengthening the Catholic party, which elected ninety-one members of the Reichstag in 1874. Finding the Catholic opposition growing stronger, and discovering a new danger to his policy in the rapid rise of a socialistic party, Bismarck came to terms with the Church, repealed nearly all of the measures directed against the clergy, and established cordial relations with the Pope. The Catholic political party—whose representatives in the Reichstag were called the *Center*—was not, however, broken up by the reversal of the government policy; and the attempt to destroy the Socialist party, which Bismarck was now free to make, proved no more successful.

## II. BISMARCK AND STATE SOCIALISM

**561. The Origin of the Socialist Movement in Germany.** Since Germany was destined to have a socialistic president in 1918, it is of great interest to follow the strong socialistic tendencies under Bismarck's administration. The Socialist party had grown up in Germany practically within Bismarck's own time. In 1842 a German professor had declared that Germany had nothing to fear from that movement since the country had no distinct working class. But within less than a quarter of a century Germany, like England and France, underwent a radical industrial revolution. Large manufacturing towns sprang up, railways were built, the working classes inevitably combined to protect and advance their own interests, and all the problems of capital and labor were suddenly thrust upon the German people.

The socialist view of the labor problems and their solution had been elaborated by a German scholar, Karl Marx, before the Revolution of 1848 (§ 447); but it was not until 1863, under the leadership of Lassalle, a radical thinker and a brilliant orator, that a General Workingmen's Association was formed at a labor congress in Leipzig. Some of the more radical socialists, under the influence of the teachings of Marx, founded a new association at Eisenach, in 1869, which bore the name of the Social-Democratic Labor Party of Germany. The two groups worked side by side until 1875, when, at a general labor congress held at Gotha, they combined, and issued an important statement of the views and purposes of the party. In the elections of that year for the Reichstag the Socialists polled three hundred and forty thousand votes and began to arouse the apprehension of the government, which was naturally suspicious of them.

**562. Bismarck outlaws the Socialists (1878).** Bismarck resented the attitude of the Socialists, and after two attempts had been made upon the life of the emperor, which he ascribed without justification to Socialist conspiracies, he had a law passed in 1878 designed to suppress socialistic agitation altogether. It prohibited meetings, publications, and associations having for

their purpose "the overthrow of the social order" or the encouragement of socialistic tendencies dangerous to the public peace, and authorized the government to proclaim military control in any city threatened by labor disturbances. This repressive law remained in force for twelve years and completely disorganized the Socialist party as far as national politics were concerned. It failed, however, in accomplishing its full purpose, for the Socialists continued to form local societies in spite of the precautions of the police and to spread their doctrines by secret methods in the factories and the army and by means of papers smuggled in, principally from Switzerland.

**563. State Socialism in Germany.** While these attempts were being made to suppress the Social Democrats, there was growing up in Germany a new school of political economists known as "State socialists," who maintained that the government should adopt a number of the socialistic schemes for the benefit of the working classes in order to remove the causes of their discontent. The practical proposals of the State socialists were exceedingly numerous. They advocated providing steady employment for the working classes, reduction of the hours of labor, improvement of the sanitary and moral conditions in factories, restriction of the labor of women and children, and adequate precautions against accidents and sickness. They proposed to equalize the distribution of wealth by taxing those whose incomes were derived from rents, interest, or speculation, and favored government ownership of railways, canals, and all means of communication and transport, of water and gas works, of a large portion of the land within city limits, of markets, and of the business of banking and insurance.

**564. Attitude of Bismarck toward Socialism.** Bismarck himself took a deep interest in the theories of the State socialists, and from 1878 to the close of his administration he advocated a number of reforms for the benefit of the working people and carried out a few of them. In undertaking these measures he frankly admitted that he was only renewing the old Hohenzollern policy of paternal interest in the welfare of the people and of increasing



the power and prosperity of the State. He accepted the capitalist system of industry and the division of society into rich and poor as a natural and permanent arrangement, but considered it the duty of the State to better the condition of the working people by special laws, as well as to encourage industry by protective tariffs.

**565. Accident and Sickness Insurance.** Bismarck looked upon certain reforms in favor of the working classes as the best means of undermining the influence of the Socialists. In 1882 the government introduced two bills providing for accident and sickness insurance, which went into effect in 1885. According to the provisions of the first law, employers were obliged to provide a fund to insure their employees against accidents. From this fund the workmen were compensated when partially or totally disabled, and in case of death provision was made for the family of the deceased. The sickness-insurance law compelled working men and women to insure themselves against sickness, but helped them to bear the burden by requiring the employer to pay a portion of the dues and to be responsible for carrying out the law.

**566. Insurance for the Aged and Incapacitated.** These measures were supplemented in 1889, after the accession of William II, by an old-age insurance law which compelled every employee with an income under five hundred dollars a year to pay a certain proportion into a State fund which provided an annual pension for him after he had reached the age of seventy years. In case he was incapacitated earlier in life he might begin to draw the pension before he reached that age. As in other forms of workingmen's insurance, the employers paid a portion of the dues; and the State also made a regular contribution to every annuity paid. In 1913 over twenty-five million persons were insured under these laws.

These measures by which the government assumed a large degree of responsibility for the welfare of the working class were regarded by the Socialists as installments of State socialism. They, however, insisted that one most important element of socialism was lacking, namely, democratic control. They felt that Bismarck's plans were

a revival and extension of the "paternalism" so familiar to Prussia in the days of Frederick the Great, which was designed to keep the people contented with the ruling classes—not to encourage the spirit of self-government.

### III. GERMANY'S POLICY OF PROTECTION AND COLONIZATION; FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**567. Growth of German Manufacturing.** Closely connected with Bismarck's paternal attitude toward the working classes was his policy of protecting German industries against foreign competition. The successful war with France, the establishment of the empire, and, above all, the payment of the French indemnity had created a great "boom" in Germany. New enterprises multiplied; in Prussia alone the number of joint-stock companies increased from 410 in 1870 to 2267 in 1874; wages rose rapidly and times were "good" until the inevitable reaction due to overspeculation set in. Prices and wages then began to fall, companies failed, and factories closed.

**568. A Protective System Established.** The manufacturers then commenced to demand that they be protected from foreign competition, and the farmers asked that high duties be placed upon the grain that was being shipped into the country from the United States and Russia. It was urged that the German "infant" industries (of which so much was heard in the United States) could not maintain themselves without aid from their government when rival nations, especially England, were so much better equipped with machinery, experience, and natural resources.

It was under these circumstances that the imperial chancellor presented to the Reichstag in 1878 a program of tariff revision embodying two main points: (1) protective duties designed to give German industries the advantage over foreign producers; (2) a reduction of duties on raw materials not produced within the empire. In the following year the Reichstag adopted the new tariff laws by a large majority and thus initiated a system under which Germany became a great manufacturing country.

**569. African Colonization.** German manufacturers were, however, not satisfied with securing protection against foreign competitors in their domestic trade; they soon began to demand government aid in finding new markets abroad. In spite of many misgivings about the ultimate value of distant colonies peopled




FIG. 82. THE JULIUS TOWER, SPANDAU, GERMANY

In this carefully guarded tower near Berlin the German government stored away about thirty million dollars from the war indemnity collected from France. The plan was to have a reserve when the next war should come. When it did come, this trifling amount was but a drop in the bucket, for the national debt incurred by Germany and the indemnity demanded by the victorious allies were reckoned not in millions but in thousands of millions

by barbarous races, Bismarck was induced by those interested in colonies to take steps toward the acquisition of territory in Africa.

**570. Togoland, Cameroons, and German Southwest Africa.** He sent out Dr. Gustav Nachtigal in 1884 for the purpose of establishing German control at certain points along the western coast of Africa. In a short time the German agent had induced native chiefs to acknowledge a German protectorate over two

large provinces, Togoland, in Upper Guinea, and Cameroons, adjoining the French Congo—in all an area of over two hundred thousand square miles.<sup>1</sup> In the same year the German flag was raised at Angra Pequena (a point on the west coast a short distance above the English possessions at the Cape of Good Hope). Within a few years the German government carved out a block of territory estimated at over three hundred and twenty thousand square miles, an area far greater than that of the entire German Empire. This colony was given the name of German Southwest Africa, but its entire European population did not exceed fifteen thousand.

**571. German East Africa.** Even larger territories were secured by Germany in East Africa. The sultan of Zanzibar was induced in 1888 to lease a strip of territory over six hundred miles long to the Germans, and in two years transferred all his rights to the German Empire for a million dollars. The few German settlers then established plantations of cocoa palms, coffee, vanilla, tobacco, rubber, sugar, tea, etc., and the government founded several experiment stations for determining the possibilities of profitable agriculture.<sup>2</sup>

**572. Bismarck's Diplomacy.** In foreign affairs Bismarck was very active. Russia had been a valued friend during the formation of the empire, and for some years afterwards the three emperors of Germany, Russia, and Austria stood together against any chance of war between France and Germany. But in 1878 Austria turned against Russia to check the latter's successful career in the Balkans (§ 782). Bismarck then sided with Austria, making an alliance with it the next year. This alliance was joined by Italy (§ 513) in 1882 and was known as the Triple

<sup>1</sup> See map of Africa, p. 460.

<sup>2</sup> About the same time German agents found their way into the Pacific and occupied a region in New Guinea to which the name of "Kaiser Wilhelm's Land" was given. The Caroline Islands (except Guam, which belongs to the United States) and a part of the Solomon group were also acquired. German merchants and investors also developed railways in Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia with a view to opening up the natural resources. Their activities in Morocco brought them into conflict with the French, who believed that they possessed special rights there, and for a time there was talk of war (see §§ 828-829).



Alliance. In the summer of 1914 Germany's friendly attitude toward Austria was one of the direct causes of the outbreak of the World War, as we shall see. But Italy, soon after the great conflict began, repudiated the Triple Alliance and joined Germany's enemies.

#### IV. REIGN OF WILLIAM II

**573. William's Divine-Right Theories.** With the accession of Germany's third emperor, William II,<sup>1</sup> in 1888, Prince Bismarck lost his power. He had been implicitly trusted by the old kaiser, William I, who had been content to leave the practical management of the empire largely in the hands of the chancellor. The new emperor proved a very different man. He was fond of making speeches in which he had much to say of the power which God had given him; indeed, he seemed to be a stout adherent of that conception of kingship which appealed to James I and Louis XIV.

**574. Bismarck Resigns (1890).** It is not strange that Bismarck should have found it hard to tolerate the intervention of the inexperienced young emperor. In March, 1890, he presented his resignation, and, amid a great demonstration of popular feeling, the "Iron Chancellor" retired to private life. Upon the announcement of Bismarck's resignation William II declared, with his usual unction: "I am as much afflicted as if I had lost my grandfather anew, but we must endure whatever God sends us, even if we should have to die for it. The post of officer on the quarter-deck of the ship of state has fallen to me. The course remains unchanged. Forward, with full steam!"

**575. German Foreign and Colonial Interests.** The German Empire, as we have seen, embarked on a colonial policy, and William II showed himself very ready to participate in world politics. At the close of the war between China and Japan, in 1895, he joined with Russia and France in preventing Japan from occupying the Liaotung peninsula. Two years later the Germans

<sup>1</sup> William II was the eldest son of Frederick III (who succeeded his father, William I, in March, 1888, and died in June of the same year) and of Victoria, the daughter of Queen Victoria of England,

seized the port of Kiaochow on the Shantung peninsula opposite Korea (§ 802).

Notwithstanding Germany's extensive colonial dominion and commercial adventures in the Far East, the whole enterprise proved of doubtful value. None of the lands acquired were really suitable for settlement by German people who wished to emigrate from the fatherland.<sup>1</sup> Especially in Africa the native races under the German flag were very warlike, and in 1905-1906 the government spent the sum of nine million dollars in suppressing local uprisings, while the value of the exports and imports of the provinces scarcely exceeded two million dollars. Still the German government poured money into her colonies and clung to them with tenacity until she lost them during the World War.

**576. William II and Socialism.** For a time it seemed as if William II proposed to conciliate the Socialist party, although he could not possibly have had any real sympathy with its aims. The legislation against the Socialists which Bismarck had inaugurated in 1878 was allowed to lapse in 1890, and they now carried on their agitation openly and with vigor and success. The emperor pledged himself to continue the social legislation begun under his grandfather, since he deemed it one of the duties of the State to relieve poverty; and he declared that the welfare of the workingman lay close to his heart. Irritated, however, at his failure to check the expression of discontent on the part of the working classes, he grew angry and pronounced the Social Democrat as "nothing better than an enemy of the empire and his country."

**577. Dissatisfaction of the Liberals and Socialists.** The liberal and radical parties naturally disapproved of the kaiser's position and powers. The emperor was not controlled by a ministry representing the majority in parliament, and public criticism of the government was liable to cause the arrest and imprisonment of the offender. Furthermore, the Reichstag could scarcely be regarded as really representing the views of the nation. The government refused to revise the apportionment of representatives

<sup>1</sup> In 1910 there were only 340 Germans in Togoland, 1132 in Cameroons, about 10,000 in German Southwest Africa, and 2700 in East Africa.

as arranged in 1871, although great changes took place after that year. As a result Berlin, for instance, had only six members in the Reichstag, although its population of two million inhabitants entitled it to twenty. This accounted for the relatively small number of Socialists and the large number of conservatives in the parliament, for in 1907 the Socialists, although they could muster 3,250,000 voters, returned only 43 members, whereas the conservatives secured 83 seats with less than 1,500,000 supporters, mainly in the country districts. In the elections of 1912 the Socialists made large gains in spite of the unequal distribution of seats.<sup>1</sup>

There was no large liberal party in Germany to oppose the ancient Prussian despotism and militarism. This task fell to the Social Democrats, who in general talked freely against militarism and imperialism and derided the kaiser's solemn pronouncements about his partnership with God. But when the war came, in 1914, only a minority of the Socialists were proof against the war spirit; in the Reichstag the party representatives, almost without exception, gave loyal support to the government's military program. Only a few of the Socialists continued to assert that the fearful conflict was a criminal enterprise of the Junkers and generals.<sup>2</sup>

### QUESTIONS

I. What powers were given to the German emperor by the constitution of the German Empire? Give an account of the legislative branch of the imperial government. Who were permitted to vote for members of the Reichstag? Describe the office of imperial chancellor. Outline the powers of the federal government.

II. Give an account of the Socialist movement in Germany through the year 1875. What was the purpose of the legislation of 1878 with

<sup>1</sup> The steady increase of socialism is shown by the following table:

| Year of election | Socialist votes | Members elected | Year of election | Socialist votes | Members elected |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1877             | 493,288         | 12              | 1903             | 3,008,000       | 81              |
| 1881             | 311,961         | 12              | 1907             | 3,251,009       | 43              |
| 1887             | 763,000         | 11              | 1912             | 4,250,300       | 110             |
| 1890             | 1,497,298       | 36              |                  |                 |                 |

<sup>2</sup> For more recent developments in Germany, see below, §§ 868 ff.

reference to socialism? What is meant by State socialism? What were the proposals of the State socialists of Germany? Discuss Bismarck's attitude toward socialism. Describe the system of State insurance for the working classes.

III. Account for the policy of protection of German industries. What was the effect of the development of German industries upon colonization in Africa and in other parts of the world?

IV. Under what circumstances did Bismarck resign the chancellorship? How did William II view his position? What was the attitude of William II toward socialism? Discuss the German colonial policy in the Far East. What criticism of the government was made by the Socialists?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) Bismarck on cabinet government, pp. 176-177; (2) the conflict with the Church, pp. 178-185; (3) Bismarck and State socialism, pp. 185-192; (4) German imperialism, pp. 193-197; (5) the reign of William II, pp. 198-207.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Bismarck (life after 1870), Germany (history between 1870 and 1914), Kulturkampf, Pius IX, Socialism (in Germany), William II, Count Caprivi, and Francis Joseph (of Austria, later years of his life).

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the government of Germany, pp. 397-403; (2) the German Empire under Bismarck, pp. 404-415; (3) Germany under William II, 1890-1914, pp. 415-426. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) the government and parties of Germany, pp. 277-285; (5) the German army, pp. 285-287; (6) Bismarck as chancellor, pp. 288-297; (7) economic progress, pp. 297-308; (8) the reign of William II, pp. 308-323.



## CHAPTER XVIII

### FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC

#### I. THE PARIS COMMUNE AND THE QUESTION OF RESTORING MONARCHY

**578.** The Third French Republic proclaimed, September 4, 1870. On September 3, 1870, Napoleon III telegraphed from Sedan to Paris, "The army is defeated and captured, and I am a prisoner."<sup>1</sup> This meant an immediate collapse of the empire which he had established some twenty years before. The Chamber of Deputies was invaded by a mob shouting for the republic, and a motion was made to dethrone Napoleon and his dynasty. Next day Gambetta, a fiery young orator from the south of France, and the deputies representing the city of Paris betook themselves to the old revolutionary storm center, the City Hall, and there proclaimed the reestablishment of a republic. This was sanctioned by an overwhelming majority of the Parisians. Meanwhile other large cities, such as Bordeaux, Marseille, and Lyon, took similar action.

**579.** The Germans invade France and lay Siege to Paris. The terrible defeat at Sedan and the capture of the emperor did not, as we know, bring the war to a close. The German invaders pressed on; city after city was taken; the strongly fortified Strasbourg fell at the end of September after a terrific bombardment, and the fortress of Metz a month later. Paris itself was surrounded by an immense German army, and the king of Prussia took up his quarters at Versailles. Gambetta, escaping from Paris in a balloon, floated safely over the lines of the besieging Germans and reached Tours. Here he invoked the memories of 1793 and sought to organize a national army of volunteers; but the raw French battalions

<sup>1</sup> After the conclusion of peace between France and Germany the Germans set Napoleon III free and he retired to England, where he died in 1873.

were easily defeated by the disciplined German regiments which had been set free by the surrender of Metz. In January, 1871, the French made their last effort to bring the enemy to terms by endeavoring to cut off his communications with Germany, but the attempt failed. Paris, reduced after a terrible siege to the point of starvation, capitulated on January 28, and an armistice was concluded.

580. **The French National Assembly.** It was arranged, upon the surrender of Paris, that the French should elect a national assembly which would legally represent the nation in dealing with the victorious enemy. The result of the elections was surprising, for only two hundred Republican candidates were chosen as against five hundred monarchists of various kinds: namely, Legitimists, who adhered to the grandson of Charles X; Orleanists, who were in favor of the grandson of Louis Philippe; and a few Bonapartists. This was largely due to the fact that Gambetta and other prominent Republicans had talked so fervidly of continuing the war at any cost that the mass of the people was fearful lest if put in power they might prolong the disastrous conflict which was ruining



FIG. 83. THIERS

Thiers, as a young man, had been one of the leaders of the Revolution of 1830, then a minister of Louis Philippe, then a strong opponent of his policy. He was also partly responsible for the Revolution of 1848. After Sedan he visited the various courts of Europe in the vain effort to win help for France. Then, as president of the French Assembly, he had to make the treaty which closed the war and arrange to pay the German indemnity. The title "Liberator of the Country" was applied to him by the middle classes of France, but the working class charged him with much cruelty in the suppression of the Commune

the country. The National Assembly, aware that Paris was strongly Republican in its sentiments, determined to meet in Bordeaux, where it held its first session on February 12.

**581. Thiers at the Head of Affairs.** Foremost among the brilliant men who composed this body was Adolphe Thiers, a historian, journalist, and politician, who for more than forty years had been a prominent figure both in literature and in affairs of State. The National Assembly appointed him "Head of the Executive Power of the French Republic." This was, of course, a temporary arrangement, and the vital question whether France was to remain a republic or to be reconverted into a monarchy was deferred until the hated Germans should be got rid of.

**582. Peace with the Germans (1871).** On February 21 Thiers hurried to Versailles to open negotiations with the German emperor and Bismarck, and on the twenty-sixth, after many stormy scenes, the terms of the preliminary treaty were formulated. France was to renounce Alsace and a part of Lorraine, which together included a population of almost 1,600,000; pay an indemnity—enormous in those days—of five billion francs; and submit to the presence of German troops until the last payment was made. The Assembly, convinced that a renewal of the war would be futile, accepted the terms imposed by the victorious Germans, and the peace documents were formally signed at Frankfurt on May 10.<sup>1</sup>

**583. The Assembly and the Paris Commune.** As soon as peace had been duly concluded with Germany the Republican minority urged that the National Assembly should dissolve itself, since it had now fulfilled its purpose. The monarchist majority, however, insisted upon continuing to govern France and proceeding to draft a constitution. Paris then rose in revolt against an Assembly which it regarded as made up of obstinate and benighted "rustics," who still clung to monarchy and had no sympathy with the needs of the great cities.

<sup>1</sup> The Germans were disappointed in their hope that the indemnity would seriously cripple France, for the first loan of two billion francs was secured in 1871 with ease, and the next year the second loan of three billions was subscribed twelve times over—thus demonstrating both the patriotism and the credit of the French people. In the autumn of 1873 the amount was paid in full and the last German soldier left the soil of France.

**584. Views of the Communards.** The siege had thrown tens of thousands out of work and had produced general demoralization in the capital. The revolutionary group, which now attempted to govern Paris, included republicans, socialists, communists, anarchists, and some who could scarcely be said to have had much interest in anything except disorder. Many of the leaders were honest men of high ideals, who were determined to defend the Republic, even by the sacrifice of their lives, as the "only form of government compatible with the rights of the people and the development of a free society." They all agreed in demanding that every *commune*, or municipality, should be left free to manage its own affairs in the interests of its own people. France would then become a sort of federation of communes, each community electing its own officers and introducing freely such social reforms as suited local conditions. It was this exalted confidence in the commune, or local government, that gained for the leaders the name of "Communards."<sup>1</sup>

**585. Cruel Suppression of the Paris Commune.** The doctrines of the Communards failed, however, to gain any considerable support in the other cities of France, and the National Assembly, which had moved to Versailles,<sup>2</sup> determined to reduce rebellious Paris to subjection. Toward the close of April, Thiers ordered a bombardment of the city's fortifications. After three weeks of fighting on the outskirts, the forces of the Assembly entered Paris by an unguarded gate on May 21, and then began a terrible period of war, murder, and arson in the city itself. For a whole week the fratricidal struggle raged, until finally, on May 28, Marshal MacMahon, who was in command of the troops, was able to announce the close of the conflict and the restoration of order. The slaughter, however, was not yet at an end, for the monarchists, with scarcely the semblance of a trial, shot hundreds

<sup>1</sup>The word "communist" is often unhappily applied to the Communards. But "communist" is best reserved for those who advocate the more or less complete abolition of private property and maintain that society as a whole should own and control, in the interests of all, the capital which is now left in the hands of individuals. Many of the Communards were communists, but the terms are not synonymous.

<sup>2</sup> Not until 1879 did the French legislature again return to Paris.



of the prisoners that had been taken. Unlike the government of the United States after the close of the Civil War, that of France under the leadership of Thiers—once a revolutionist himself—forgave no one. Seventy-five hundred of the insurgents were sent to the colony for criminals in New Caledonia and thirteen thousand were condemned to imprisonment at hard labor or sent into exile.

**586. The Royalist Factions in the Assembly.** The National Assembly was at last free to turn to the vexed question of settling upon a permanent form of government for the distracted country. There would have been little difficulty in reëstablishing the monarchy if the monarchists had not been hopelessly divided among themselves (§ 391 and genealogical table). Some of them, known as the Legitimists because they regarded the older Bourbon line as the lawful one, were in favor of bestowing the crown on the count of Chambord, a grandson of Charles X (who had been deposed by the Orleanist revolution in 1830). The Orleanists, who wished to see a restoration of the House of Orleans, which had been overthrown in 1848, had a strong candidate in the person of the count of Paris, a grandson of Louis Philippe. These two groups of monarchists had nothing in common but their opposition to a republic; their hatred of each other was bitter and uncompromising.

**587. Thiers elected President of the Republic.** In view of these divisions all factions were willing to postpone for a time the final solution of the problem, each hoping meanwhile to gain strength by delay. This policy was sanctioned by Thiers, who, elected president of the Republic in August, 1871, urged the Assembly to devote its attention to the pressing task of strengthening the army and restoring the prosperity of France. Smarting under the humiliation of their defeat by the Germans, the Assembly passed a new army law which bound every Frenchman to military service for five years in the active service and fifteen years in the reserve force.<sup>1</sup> The frontier defenses were strengthened, the

<sup>1</sup> This was gradually reduced later to two years in active service and eleven years in the reserve. In 1913, however, the term of active service was lengthened to three years, in order to keep pace with the increasing German army.

army equipped with the most improved instruments of war, and the war department completely reorganized.

**588. The Monarchists fail to reestablish Royalty.** It seemed for a time as if monarchy would be reestablished in France. Thiers lost his popularity in the National Assembly by advocating the continuance of the Republic and was succeeded by one of Napoleon III's generals, Marshal MacMahon (May, 1873). The monarchists then agreed that the Legitimist candidate should be recognized as "Henry V," and on his death should be succeeded by the Orleanist candidate, the count of Paris. But "Henry V" fell out with the Assembly over his refusal to give up the old white flag of the Bourbons in favor of the tricolored flag adopted during the first French Revolution. The Orleanists, irritated by his high claims for his branch of the family, turned to the Bonapartists and Republicans with a proposition to prolong the term of Marshal MacMahon, as president of the Republic, for a period of seven years, in the hope that by the time his term expired they could gain sufficient strength to place their own candidate on the throne.

## II. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE THIRD REPUBLIC AND ITS CONSTITUTION

**589. A Republican Government Sanctioned (1875).** The Assembly meanwhile continued its confused and heated debates,—the Republicans demanding the establishment without further delay of a republican constitution; the Legitimists urging the retirement of Marshal MacMahon in favor of "Henry V"; and the Orleanists insisting upon the president's continuance in office until 1880. Finally, at the beginning of the year 1875, four years after the election of the Assembly, it at last took up seriously the consideration of a permanent form of government, and on January 29 a motion was carried by a majority of one, providing that the president of the "Republic" should be elected by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. Thus the Republicans finally secured, by the narrowest possible margin, the statement in the constitution itself that France was to be a republic.

**590. Peculiarity of the Constitution of France.** The restoration of the monarchy having now become impossible, for the time being at least, the Assembly proceeded with the work of completing a form of government, not by drafting an elaborate constitution but by passing a series of laws. These separate laws, supplemented by later amendments, formed the constitution of the Third Republic, which consequently differed in many fundamental ways from all the previous French constitutions. It contained no reference to the sovereignty of the people, it included no bill of rights enumerating the liberties of French citizens, and it made no definite provision for maintaining a republican form of government. It, in fact, bore throughout the marks of hasty compilation, designed as it was to tide the nation over a crisis until one of the contending parties in the Assembly could secure a triumphant majority. Nevertheless, despite the expectations of many who took part in its making, it has lasted longer and provided a more stable government than any of the numerous constitutions France has had since 1789. In more than fifty years few changes have been made.

**591. The Position of the President.** Under this new constitution the president of the French Republic occupied a position rather more like that of the king of England than that of the president of the United States—he presided over the government but left the conduct of affairs to a premier and cabinet; he was more an ornamental than an active head of the State, representing it in great official functions, but exercising little of the power he outwardly seemed to possess. He was elected for a term of seven years, not by the people at large but by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, which met as one body in Versailles for the purpose. He selected his cabinet principally from among the members of the chambers, and the ministers thus chosen could exercise a powerful control over his policy and appointments. The real head of the government was the prime minister, as in England. The president was not given a veto—such as is enjoyed by the president of the United States—but might return a measure to the Chamber and Senate for reconsideration.





### OPENING OF THE OPERA, PARIS

This magnificent building was begun by Napoleon III and completed under the Third Republic





**592. The Senate and Chamber of Deputies.** The parliament consisted of two houses, differing in this respect from the legislative bodies established in 1791 and 1848. The members of the Chamber of Deputies (about 600 in number) were to be chosen for a term of four years directly by the people, and every man over twenty-one years of age—unless he were in active service in the army—was permitted to vote. The three hundred senators were chosen indirectly for a term of nine years—one third of them every three years—by a small group of local government officers in each department.

**593. Unusual Powers of the French Parliament.** It will be observed that the French parliament was more powerful than the Congress of the United States. It not only elected the president, who was under the control of a ministry representing the majority in the chambers, but it might by meeting in joint session amend the constitution without the necessity of submitting the changes to the people for their ratification. There was no supreme court in France to declare the measures of parliament unconstitutional, and the president could not veto them. Like the members of the English cabinet, the French ministers resigned when they found their policy was no longer supported by a majority in the Chamber of Deputies.

**594. The Republicans Triumphant.** The National Assembly, after completing the laws which still serve France as a constitution, dissolved on December 31, 1875, and a regular election was held throughout France for the purpose of choosing the members of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. This resulted in an overwhelming majority for the Republicans in the Chamber, and even in the Senate there were enough of them to give them the balance of power among the conflicting royalist factions. The president, Marshal MacMahon, found himself unable to work in harmony with the deputies. After continuing the struggle until 1879, he resigned and was succeeded by an unmistakable Republican, Jules Grévy.

**595. Freedom of the Press and of Public Assemblies.** Still further strengthened by the elections of 1881, the Republicans undertook a number of urgent reforms. The press had been

declared free in 1789 and in 1815, but the government had constantly watched the newspapers and punished editors who offended it by too frank criticism. At last, in 1881, the licenses previously required of those who wished to undertake new publications were abolished, publishers were no longer forced to give bonds in order to insure their respectful treatment of the government, and the police courts were deprived of their right to try those accused of defaming government officials. Akin to this reform was the right extended to any group of citizens to hold public meetings, on condition that they should merely announce their intention to the authorities. In 1884, after nearly a hundred years of harsh repressive legislation directed against all labor associations, a law was passed permitting workingmen to form unions. Finally, the government undertook a series of measures with a view of freeing the schools from the influence of the clergy, who were accused of undermining the loyalty of the children to the Republic. These measures will be considered presently.

**596. Disappearance of the Monarchical Parties.** Year by year the French Republic gained in the number of its adherents and in the confidence of the other powers of Europe. The death of the son of Napoleon III in 1879 was a fatal blow to the already declining hopes of the Bonapartists, and the death of the childless count of Chambord, "Henry V," in 1883 left the Legitimist faction without a head. A few Orleanists clung to their candidate, the count of Paris, until his death in 1894, but the elections of the preceding year, which resulted in the choice of only seventy-three royalist deputies,—Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists—showed that France was at last through with kings and emperors and was ready to commit herself permanently to a republican form of government.

### III. THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

**597. The Clergy Hostile to the Republic.** The Catholic clergy had from the first been hostile to the Republic, for they had reason to fear that the new government, composed largely of anticlericals, insisting upon freedom of the press and public schools, would




FIG. 84. PARIS

Paris was largely rebuilt in the nineteenth century, mainly according to the plans of Napoleon III's engineers, with broad, shaded streets and many fine public buildings. The picture shows the river Seine, which cuts the city into two main regions, connected by many handsome bridges



sooner or later undermine their authority. The head of the Church, Pius IX, in a solemn statement called the Syllabus of 1864, had denounced in no uncertain terms what he regarded as the great dangers and errors of the age. Among these were religious toleration, liberty of conscience, freedom of the press and of speech, separation of Church and State, and nonreligious education. The Republicans were pledged to just those things which the Pope condemned. It was inevitable, therefore, that the clerical party should do all in its power to discredit the Republic and bring about a restoration of the monarchy. The Jesuits and other religious orders who maintained schools were accused of implanting in the children's minds a distrust of the republican government. The religious newspapers represented the Republic as an unfortunate accident which had put ungodly men in power but which would doubtless speedily give way to a more legitimate form of government.

**598. The Anticlericals.** This attitude on the part of the clergy naturally made the Republicans more strongly anticlerical than ever. They came to hate the clergy and all they stood for. Gambetta declared that clericalism was "*the enemy.*" Indeed, it was not until 1892 that Leo XIII admonished the French bishops and priests to "accept the Republic, that is to say, the established power which exists among you; respect it and submit to it as representing the power which comes from God."

In spite of this peaceful advice on the part of the head of the Church, peace did not follow. On the contrary the struggle between Church and State in France grew in bitterness, until finally the Republic proved the victor and succeeded in depriving the Church of a great part of those sources of political influence which remained to it after the losses it suffered during the French Revolution. The opponents of the Church had two main objects in view: (1) to take the schools from the control or influence of the clergy and prevent the children of France from being brought up as monarchists, and (2) to relieve the government from the burden of paying the salaries of the clergy and to bring about the complete separation of Church and State.

**599. Secular Public Schools.** The first step was to increase the number of public schools which might serve to attract pupils away from the convent and other Church schools. By laws passed in 1881-1886 instruction was made free in the primary public schools, no clergyman was to be employed as a teacher in them, and compulsory education for children between six and thirteen years was established.

**600. Monastic Orders Dissolved (1901).** Many of the monastic orders and various other religious associations which had lost their property and then been abolished during the first revolution (§§ 223-225) had been reestablished, and new ones had been created. Most of them were devoted to charity or to education.

In 1901 the "Associations Law" was passed. This provided that no religious order could continue to exist in France without authorization from the parliament, and that no one belonging to a nonauthorized association should be permitted to teach or to conduct a school. Within two years ten thousand religious schools were closed. Then a law was passed providing that within ten years all teaching carried on by religious associations should cease. As a result of these laws there were in the year 1909-1910 over five million French children in the public and other secular schools and less than one hundred thousand enrolled in those connected with religious associations.

**601. The Concordat of 1801.** The attack on the religious orders was only the prelude to the complete separation of Church and State which had been advocated for a century by the opponents of the Church. In 1795 the French Convention had proclaimed this separation and refused longer to pay the salaries of the clergy, or in any way to recognize the existence of the Church except as a voluntary association which should be supported by those who wished to belong to it. Bonaparte, however, partially restored the old system in the Concordat which he arranged with the Pope in 1801 (§§ 294-295). Bonaparte did not give back the property of the Church of which it had been deprived by the first French Assembly in 1789, but he agreed that the government should pay the salaries of the bishops and priests whose

appointment it controlled. Although the Catholic religion was recognized as that of the majority of Frenchmen, the State also helped support the Calvinist and Lutheran churches and the Jewish religious community.

Amid all the later political changes, the settlement reached by Bonaparte was retained essentially unaltered. Louis XVIII, Charles X, Louis Philippe, and Napoleon III had no desire to do away with the Concordat, which afforded them an important control over the Church and the clergy.

**602. Separation of Church and State (1905).** But with the establishment of the republic all this was changed, owing to the strong monarchical sympathies of the clergy. There were, moreover, large numbers of Frenchmen who, if not actively opposed to the Church, had no interest in religion. To these it seemed wrong that the government should be paying forty million francs a year to clergymen for teaching what this class did not believe in. Nevertheless, it was no easy task to put asunder Church and State, which had been closely associated with each other since the days of the Roman Empire. It was not until December, 1905, that the "Separation Law" was promulgated.

The main provisions of the new law were relatively simple. It suppressed all government appropriations for religious purposes, but provided pensions for clergymen of long service and the gradual extinction of the salaries of others. It declared that cathedrals, churches, the residences of bishops, and other ecclesiastical buildings belonged to the government, but should be placed at the disposal of congregations and their pastors free of charge. The management of these edifices and the control of other property of the Church were vested in "associations for religious worship" (*associations cultuelles*) composed of from seven to twenty-five persons according to the size of the commune.

**603. The Opposition of the Pope and the Clergy.** It soon became evident that the Pope and a large Catholic party were determined not to accept these provisions. The clergy, obedient to the commands of the head of the Church, refused to obey the new law and most of them declined the proffered pensions. The

nation at large, however, evidently supported the government in its plans, for the elections held in May, 1906, returned a large majority of radicals, Socialists, and progressives committed to the execution of the law. But there was some disorder, and an arrangement was made to avoid the interruption of religious services, even if the law was not complied with.

**604. Outcome of the Struggle.** Although the Pope again denounced the new laws as a confiscation of the Church's property and an attempt to destroy Christianity in France, the excitement died down. The French government no longer helped support either the Catholic or any other form of religion; on the other hand, it did not interfere, as formerly, in the election of prelates, but left the Church free to choose its bishops and priests and to hold religious conventions when and where it wished. It converted the palaces of the bishops, the parsonages, and the seminaries into schools, hospitals, and other public institutions, but it permitted the churches to be used for public worship.

#### IV. POLITICAL PARTIES IN FRANCE: THE SOCIALISTS

**605. Monarchists and Republicans.** Like Germany and Italy, the third French republic was from the beginning perplexed by the rise of many political parties. For a long time the monarchists—Orleanists, Bourbons, and Bonapartists—held the balance of power, and if they could have agreed, France would have been a monarchy of some kind. Against them were the Republicans, men of various shades of opinion, held together by a single desire to establish the Republic on firm foundations. When once that great object was attained, the Republican party was shattered into many fragments, for its members differed widely among themselves on questions of taxation, labor and capital, and colonial policies.

**606. The Socialists.** In a few years a socialistic party, which had figured so largely in the Revolution of 1848 and the Commune of 1870, reappeared. In 1879 the Socialists launched a national campaign at a general conference held in Marseille. The



following year a general amnesty was granted to all who had been connected with the Commune, and a great labor convention was immediately held in Paris, where the doctrines of Karl Marx were accepted as the fundamental principles of French socialism.

**607. Marxians and "Possibilists."** Notwithstanding their general agreement as to their ends, the French Socialists have from the very first been divided over the question of the best methods of attaining their aims. Broadly speaking, there have been two groups, each with varying shades of opinion. In the first place there have been the Marxians, who expect socialism to be ushered in by a crisis in which the workingmen will seize the supreme power and use it for their own benefit, as the middle class did in the previous revolutions. The second, and more numerous, Socialist group went by the name of the "Possibilists," because they did not believe that socialistic ideas could be carried into effect as the result of a violent revolution, but hoped to see them realized by a gradual process in which the government would assume control and ownership of one industry after another.

**608. Socialists admitted to the French Cabinet.** The various socialistic factions united at the general election in 1893 and succeeded in returning about fifty members to the Chamber of Deputies, thus inaugurating a new era in French politics. The Socialist vote steadily increased until in 1899 the prime minister was forced to accept a Socialist, Millerand (later prime minister and president of the republic), as Minister of Commerce in order to control enough votes in the Chamber to carry on the government. After this event the Possibilists were from time to time represented in the cabinet and worked for their ends by combining with other parties. The regular Socialists, however, expelled Millerand from the party and adopted the general policy of refusing to coöperate in the formation of cabinets.

**609. The French Party System.** In England and the United States there have been two great parties, one of which was ordinarily in unmistakable control. In France there have been so many parties that no single one could ever long command a majority of votes in the Chamber of Deputies. As a result measures could

not be carried simply because the leaders of one party agreed on them, but they had to appeal to a number of groups on their own merits. Minorities, consequently, have had an opportunity to influence legislation in France, and there was little chance for party "machines" to develop. It is true that French ministries have risen and fallen at very short intervals, but nevertheless the laws which did pass received more careful attention, perhaps, than they would had they been pushed through as party measures.

**610. "Interpellations."** The opponents of a ministry in the Chamber of Deputies have been accustomed to take advantage of the privilege of asking the ministers questions in regard to their policy and thus forcing them to explain their motives. When a deputy formally announced that he was going to "interpellate" the ministers, he had to be given an opportunity to do so within a certain period at a regular session of the Chamber. These "interpellations" have been more common in France than elsewhere, but are not unknown in other governments.

## V. EXPANSION OF FRANCE

**611. French Colonial Dominion in 1870.** While solving grave problems at home the Third Republic pushed forward its commercial, exploring, and military enterprises until it built up a colonial dominion vaster than that lost during the eighteenth century in the conflicts with England, though less valuable and less inviting to French emigrants. When the Third Republic was established, French colonial possessions consisted of Algeria in northern Africa, the Senegal region on the west coast of Africa, some minor posts scattered along the Gulf of Guinea down to the Congo River, a foothold in Cochin China, and a number of small islands in various parts of the world. The basis of territorial expansion had thus been laid, and after the quick recovery which followed the reverses of the German war the French government frankly committed itself to a policy of colonial enterprise.

**612. The French annex Tunis.** The great North African province of Algeria (seized by France in 1830) is only slightly

smaller than France itself and has a population of over five millions, of whom only about eight hundred thousand are of European origin. To the east of Algeria lies the province of Tunis, equaling in area the state of New York and having a population akin to that of Algeria in race and religion. Tunisian tribes were accused by the French of disturbing the peace of the Algerian border, and in 1881 France dispatched troops into Tunis. After some serious fighting the province was occupied and its ruler was practically forced to surrender the administration of his possessions to the French government, in whose hands it remained.

**613. Senegal and the Congo.** While these enterprises were bringing northern Africa under French dominion, a series of daring explorations and conquests in western and central Africa were adding vast regions and millions of African natives to the French colonial domain. France had taken formal possession of the province of Senegal on the west coast as early as 1637, but no serious efforts to extend her control were made until the annexation of Algeria called attention to the advantage of joining the two provinces by conquering the inland regions. To these possessions was added a vast region north of the Congo River more than twice the size of France and now known as French Congo. The vast extent of the French possessions in northwestern Africa will become apparent as one glances at the map, p. 460.

**614. Madagascar (1896).** While the French explorers were pushing their way through the jungles of the Senegal and Congo regions, or braving the sand-storms of the Sahara, French missionaries and commercial agents were preparing the way for the annexation of the island of Madagascar. Using as a pretext the murder of some French citizens by the natives, the French waged war on the ruler of Madagascar (1882-1885), and ultimately succeeded in establishing control over the entire island.

**615. The "Fashoda Incident."** In the year 1898 Marchand, a French explorer, pressed eastward across the Sahara Desert from the French possessions on the west and reached the Nile region, where he raised the French flag at Fashoda, in the Sudan, over lands claimed by the English. An English force, however, compelled



Marchand to lower the flag, and for a time it looked as if the two countries might come to blows. Fortunately, however, the French withdrew, and the two nations arranged the disputed boundaries between them. France withdrew from Egypt and the Sudan; England, on her part, withdrew any claims upon Morocco, which was the next tempting bit of Africa to divide up. France then was free, apparently, to round out her great empire of north-west Africa (§§ 828-829 below).

**616. French Possessions in Asia.** France, as we have seen, lost her hold on India during the Seven Years' War (§ 74), but during the nineteenth century she indemnified herself by gradually building up French Indo-China, a vast colonial realm on the west shores of the China Sea (see map, p. 436). Some French missionaries had been killed in Anam, and Napoleon III used this as an excuse for attacking

its king and demanding a portion of his territory. Having obtained this foothold the French government gradually extended its control in all directions. Protectorates were first established over Cambodia and Cochin China, and then districts were annexed. The Chinese emperor was forced to surrender his claim in Tonkin, and in 1893 France extended her authority over Laos to the west. The French are thus intrenched on the southern border of China



FIG. 85. THE "FASHODA INCIDENT"

The English expedition, which has just come up the Nile in the steamboats, is surprised to find the tricolor of France floating at Fashoda. Colonel Marchand is just receiving the Sirdar, as the English commanding officer in Egypt was termed



and have been busy securing mining concessions and planning railways.<sup>1</sup> The subject of the partition of Africa and the control of Asia will be dealt with as a whole in Chapters XXIV, XXV.

### QUESTIONS

I. Under what circumstances did the Third French Republic come into existence? Outline the course of the Franco-Prussian War from the battle of Sedan to the surrender of Paris. For what purpose was the National Assembly elected in 1871? Describe the means by which the Assembly accomplished this purpose. What was the cause of the ill feeling between the people of Paris and the National Assembly in March, 1871.

Who were the Communards and what were their views on government? What does "communist" mean? Describe the suppression of the Commune. What parties were to be found in the National Assembly? What was the effect of their inability to agree upon the form of government established in France in August, 1871? Describe the means taken in 1871 to strengthen the position of France. Who succeeded Thiers as president of France? Upon what problem were the monarchist parties at work from 1873 to 1875?

II. Describe the constitution of France. Compare the position of the president of the French Republic with that of the king of England and the president of the United States. Describe the legislative branch of the French government, contrasting it with that of the United States.

Under what circumstances did Marshal MacMahon resign the presidency? Mention the reforms instituted by the Republicans in the years 1881-1884.

III. Account for the hostility between Church and State in France. What has been the program of the anticlerical party during the last twenty-five years? Outline the relations of Church and State in France from 1901 to 1905.

IV. Give a brief account of the history of political parties in France. In what way does the party system of France differ from that of England and the United States? What is an "interpellation"?

V. Locate on a map the colonial possessions of France before 1870. Trace on maps the colonial expansion of France in Africa since the establishment of the Third Republic. What was the "Fashoda incident" and what were its results? What possessions has France in Asia?

<sup>1</sup> For additions to French dominion at the close of the World War see § 1028.

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) the establishment of the Third Republic, pp. 208-215; (2) the Boulanger and Dreyfus affairs, pp. 215-223; (3) separation of Church and State, pp. 223-232; (4) French political parties, pp. 233-237; (5) the expansion of France, pp. 237-238.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Napoleon III (later years of his life), Commune, Adolphe Thiers, Concordat, Marshal MacMahon, Léon Gambetta, General Boulanger, Émile Zola, Dreyfus Affair, Tunis, Madagascar, and Cambodia.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the making of the Third Republic, pp. 331-345; (2) the bourgeois and the clericals, pp. 345-361; (3) political parties, pp. 361-367. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) Thiers and the reconstruction of France, pp. 220-227; (5) the government and parties of France, pp. 227-239; (6) political development, pp. 239-244, 248-257; (7) separation of Church and State, pp. 257-263; (8) economic progress and social reform, pp. 244-248, 264-270; (9) French literature, pp. 272-276.

## CHAPTER XIX

### POLITICAL AND SOCIAL REFORMS IN ENGLAND

#### I. EXTENSION OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

**617. Need of Reforming Parliament; the "Rotten Boroughs."** In the eighteenth century the English system had been praised by students of government as by far the most liberal and enlightened in Europe. Although they had no written constitution, the English had won two important safeguards for their liberties—a parliament, free from the king's control, to make their laws, and a good system of courts, equally free from royal interference, to see that the laws were properly carried out. But in the nineteenth century it became apparent that there was great need of reform in both branches of the government, and that the mass of the people, if free from the tyranny of a king, were, after all, not in possession of self-government.

The reform of Parliament was the most pressing need; for Parliament had ceased to represent the nation at large and had become a council of wealthy landlords and nobles. This was due to two things. In the first place, there were the so-called "rotten boroughs." Such towns as had in earlier times been summoned by the king to send their two representatives each to Parliament continued to do so at the opening of the nineteenth century, regardless of the number of their inhabitants, and no new boroughs had been added to the list since the reign of Charles II. Dunwich, which had been buried under the waters of the North Sea for two centuries, was duly represented, as well as the famous borough of Old Sarum, which was only a green mound where a town had once stood.

**618. Newer Cities Unrepresented.** On the other hand, mere villages had grown into great cities, and the newer towns which had developed under the influence of the Industrial Revolution,

like Birmingham, Manchester, and Leeds, had no representatives at all. Moreover it was not only in the towns that representation was wholly unequal. The county of Cornwall, with a population of a quarter of a million, had forty-four representatives, while all Scotland, with eight times that population, was entitled to only one more member.

**619. Few Persons permitted to Vote.** In the second place, few persons had a right to vote, even in the towns which had representation in Parliament. In some boroughs all taxpayers had the right to take part in elections, but this varied greatly. In one of these—Gatton—there were only seven voters. In other boroughs the right of choosing the members of Parliament was exercised by the mayor and town council, who were often not elected by the people at all.

Many of the boroughs were owned outright by members of the House of Lords or others, who easily forced the few voters to choose any candidate they proposed.<sup>1</sup>

In the country districts matters were no better. It is true that every person owning land which brought in forty shillings a year was permitted to vote for members of Parliament, but the disappearance of most of the small farmers had reduced the voters to the few who owned large estates. To take an extreme case, in the Scottish county of Bute, with its population of fourteen thousand inhabitants, there were twenty-one voters, of whom all but one were nonresidents.

**620. Prevalence of Bribery.** Bribery was prevalent and was fostered by the system of public balloting. The election was held in the open air. The sheriff, presiding, read off the list of candidates, and the voters shouted and raised their hands to show their choice. A defeated candidate might then demand a roll call, and each voter had then to sign his name in a poll book so that

<sup>1</sup> The duke of Norfolk chose eleven members of the House of Commons, Lord Lonsdale, nine, and Lord Darlington, seven; while other peers had one or more representatives in the Commons. In 1828 the duke of Newcastle evicted over five hundred of his tenants because they refused to vote for his candidate, and when this led to a protest in Parliament he replied, "Have I not a right to do as I like with my own?"



everyone might know how he voted. Naturally there was much intimidation and electioneering as well as bribery.<sup>1</sup>

**621. England really an Oligarchy.** Thus, through the extreme unfairness in apportioning the members, the curious methods of balloting, open bribery, and ownership of boroughs, the House of Commons was ordinarily under the control of a comparatively few men. A very cautious scholar of our own day estimates that not more than one third of the representatives in the House of Commons were fairly chosen.

**622. Early Proposals for Reform.** The whole system was so obviously absurd that it is not surprising that objections to it had long been common. As early as the middle of the eighteenth century the evils were severely attacked, and during the democratic agitation which preceded and accompanied the French Revolution several attempts were made to induce Parliament to reform itself. The elder Pitt (Lord Chatham), in 1770, and later his distinguished son, the younger Pitt, proposed changes. But the French Revolution came before anything was done, and the excesses of the French Convention during the Reign of Terror put an end to all hope of reform for some time. Even the more cool-headed and progressive among the English statesmen were discouraged by the apparently disastrous results in France of permitting the people at large to vote. Indeed, until 1830 England was under Tory rule, and the government adopted harsh measures to prevent all agitation for reform.

**623. Renewal of the Agitation.** After the overthrow of Napoleon, orators, writers, and agitators redoubled their efforts to arouse the working classes to action. Hampden clubs were founded to propagate reform doctrines, and monster demonstrations and parades were organized to prove to the government the great strength of the movement. At one of these meetings in Manchester in 1819 the police and soldiers attacked the populace

<sup>1</sup> Hogarth shows the humorous side of such an election in the picture which is reproduced on page 98 above. The crippled, the sick, and the old are brought to the election booth, where they are being persuaded to vote one way or another. The secret ballot was established in 1872 (see below, § 631, end).

without provocation and killed and wounded a large number.<sup>1</sup> The government was frightened by the growing agitation and passed a series of laws known as the Six Acts, which restricted the rights of free press, free speech, and public meeting.

**624. Business Men urge Reform.** This attempt at repression could not last, however, for it was not only the working classes but the rich and powerful merchants and manufacturers as well who demanded the revision of a system which excluded them from political power. The Whigs, under the leadership of Lord John Russell, urged parliamentary reform again and again in the House of Commons. The Revolution of 1830 in France added impetus to the agitation in England, and that staunch Tory, the Duke of Wellington, was obliged to resign his premiership on account of the strong and threatening demand for reform.

**625. The Reform Bill of 1832.** The Whigs, or "Reformers," were then called to power, and in March, 1831, Lord John Russell introduced a reform bill into the House of Commons, where it was violently opposed. A new election was held, resulting in a triumph for the reform party, which carried the bill through the Commons by a substantial majority. It was, however, rejected by the House of Lords. The Commons then replied by passing another bill of the same character as the first, and the country awaited with anxiety the action of the peers. Finally, King William IV gave way to the Reformers and granted permission to the prime minister "to create such a number of peers as will insure the passage of the reform bill." The lords, realizing that further opposition was useless, gave way, and in June, 1832, the long-debated bill became a law.

According to its provisions fifty-six "rotten boroughs," each containing less than two thousand inhabitants, were entirely deprived of representation; thirty-two more, with less than four thousand inhabitants, lost one member each; and forty-three new boroughs were created with one or two members each, according

<sup>1</sup> This assault, known as the "Peterloo massacre," occurred in St. Peter's Field, then on the outskirts, but now in the heart, of Manchester.

to their respective populations. The counties were divided into election districts and assigned a representation corresponding more nearly than theretofore with the number of their inhabitants. The suffrage was given in the towns to all citizens who owned or



FIG. 86. THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, LONDON

This massive building stands on the site of an old royal palace, between Westminster Abbey, which is not shown but is just across the street at the right, and the river Thames, which runs along the other side. The House of Commons met in the chapel of this palace—St. Stephens—from the middle of the sixteenth century until 1834, when the palace was burned down, with the exception of the great hall with the plain roof in the foreground. The new building, completed in 1867, is richly ornamented. From its main tower, 340 feet high, a flag is flown by day when Parliament is in session, and by night a light shines over the clock tower, which stands by Westminster Bridge

rented houses worth ten pounds (about fifty dollars) a year, and to *renters* as well as *owners* of lands of a certain value in the country. In this way the shopkeepers and manufacturers and some of the more prosperous people in the country were given the right to vote, but nearly all workingmen and agricultural laborers were still excluded from voting.

**626. Slight Extension of the Right to vote in 1832.** The great Reform Bill of 1832 was therefore not really a triumph for democracy. It was estimated from official returns in 1836 that out of a total number of 6,023,752 adult males there were only 839,519 voters. The thousands whose parades and demonstrations had frightened the Duke of Wellington and the king into yielding were naturally dissatisfied with the outcome. The fact that those who came into power under the new bill—mostly representing the new capitalistic class—showed little inclination to relieve the condition of the working classes, whose wages were pitifully low and whose homes were miserable hovels, added bitterness to their disappointment.

**627. The Chartist Movement.** The Reform Bill had scarcely been signed before a veritable flood of pamphlet literature appeared, proposing more radical measures. Translations of Magna Carta and reprints of the Bill of Rights and the acts of the Long Parliament abolishing the House of Lords and the kingship (Vol. I, § 842) were circulated as leaflets among the working classes. At last six demands were embodied in a "Charter"; to wit, universal suffrage, vote by secret ballot, annual election of Parliament, payment of members of Parliament, abolition of property qualifications for members of Parliament, and equal electoral districts.

In the opening year of Queen Victoria's reign<sup>1</sup> this Charter won thousands of adherents, to whom the name of "Chartists" was given. Local Chartist clubs were founded in every manufacturing town, and in 1840 a national Charter Association was organized for the purpose of federating the various clubs. Great meetings and parades were held all over England; the Charter was transformed into a petition, to which it was claimed that over a million signatures were obtained. This petition was presented to Parliament in 1839 only to be rejected by a large vote.

Despairing of securing reforms by peaceful means, some of the leaders began openly to advocate revolutionary violence, and

<sup>1</sup> George III died in 1820. He had been insane for some years, during which his son, afterward George IV, was regent. George IV's reign lasted from 1820 to 1830, when his brother, William IV, succeeded. Their niece, Victoria, succeeded in 1837, reigning until 1901.



rioting spread to such an extent that the government had to resort to extraordinary police measures to suppress it. No serious revolt, however, occurred.

**628. The Collapse of Chartism (1848).** The Revolution of 1848 in France and the establishment of the Second Republic gave the signal for the last great outburst of Chartist enthusiasm. Owing to the hard times in that year, thousands of workmen were unemployed, and the poor were roused to bitter hatred for a government that replied to demands for reform by police measures. Preparations were made to present another gigantic petition to the House of Commons, to which it was claimed that six million names had been secured, and the Chartist leaders determined to overawe Parliament by a march on London. Though this show of force was frustrated by the aged Duke of Wellington, then commander of the troops policing London, the petition was finally presented to the House of Commons. It was referred to a committee, which reported that there were less than two million names and that many of these were evidently spurious, such as "Victoria Rex," "the Duke of Wellington," "Pugnose," and "Snooks." The petition was thereby greatly discredited, and Parliament refused to take any action on it. Chartism, as an organized movement, thereupon collapsed.

**629. Gladstone espouses Reform (1866).** The cause of parliamentary reform was not, however, lost with the failure of the

\* Victoria was much beloved by the British, and her name was connected with the proudest age of the British Empire. English literature and art of the last half of the nineteenth century are often spoken of as belonging to the Victorian age, and it was in her reign that the colonies became real, self-governing "dominions." The celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of the queen's reign in 1897 was the most magnificent spectacle of modern times. It was attended by practically all the other sovereigns of Europe, including Victoria's grandson, the German emperor, and it brought together, for the first time, the statesmen of the widely scattered "dominions beyond the seas." One should have in mind all this splendor and power of the empress-queen when one looks at this picture of the young girl who was roused from her sleep on June 20, 1837, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and another official, to be told of the death of her uncle, William IV, and her accession to the throne. Victoria received them with quiet dignity, although clad in a wrapper and shawl, with her hair falling over her shoulders and her feet hurriedly thrust into slippers.



QUEEN VICTORIA NOTIFIED OF HER ACCESSION\*



Chartist movement. The doctrines of democracy had been spread among the people by the agitation, and at length in 1866 Gladstone, as leader of the House of Commons, made the question an issue of practical politics. Mr. Gladstone was then fifty-seven years old. He had entered Parliament as a Tory at the first election after the Reform Bill of 1832 and had quickly shown himself a commanding orator and a capable politician. At the end of a few years his views on public questions began to change, and at length he broke with the conservative traditions of his youth and became a Liberal. In a debate on parliamentary reform in 1864 he maintained that the burden of proof rested on those "who would exclude forty-nine fiftieths of the working classes from the franchise."

**630. Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield).** At the opening of Parliament in 1866 Gladstone proposed a moderate extension of the franchise, which was still based on property qualifications. This measure displeased many of Gladstone's followers because it went too far, and others because it did not go far enough. Consequently the cabinet felt compelled to resign, and a Conservative ministry was formed, represented in the House of Commons by Benjamin Disraeli (afterwards created Lord Beaconsfield), one of the most striking figures in the political life of England during the nineteenth century. His Jewish origin, his conspicuous style of dress, his florid oratory, and his novels and other literary works served to attract the attention of the public. Those, however, who were inclined to laugh at him at first soon came to recognize him as a leader of great force and a politician of remarkable ability.

**631. Doubling of English Voters in 1867.** The Conservatives, as the old Tory party had come to be called, were alarmed by the general demand for reform and by some rioting which took place in Hyde Park, and Disraeli was able to secure the passage of a reform bill in spite of the denunciations of some of his fellow Conservatives and the smiles of the Liberals,<sup>1</sup> who taunted him with advocating changes which he had long opposed. The new

<sup>1</sup> The followers of Gladstone were termed Liberal rather than Whig, from which party most of them came.



law of 1867 granted the right to vote to every adult male in the larger towns who occupied for twelve months, either as owner or as tenant, a dwelling within the borough ; also to lodgers who paid ten pounds or more a year for unfurnished rooms. In the country it permitted those to vote who owned property which produced an




FIG. 87. MEN RIOTING FOR THE SUFFRAGE IN HYDE PARK (1866)

The great reforms in England in the nineteenth century were achieved with little disorder, but there would have been more if the government had not yielded in time

income of at least five pounds net a year, and all renters paying at least twelve pounds annually. This served to double the previous number of voters.<sup>1</sup>

A further reform was the adoption of the secret ballot in 1872, instead of the old, disorderly method of public elections described above.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It may be said here, once for all, that in England, as in most European countries, it is customary to exclude from the suffrage all paupers, criminals, the insane, and certain other classes of persons.

<sup>2</sup> See § 620. The form of ballot used was copied from that in use in the colony of Victoria, Australia, and is known as the Australian ballot. It has been adopted in many countries.

**632. The Reform Bill of 1884.** In 1884 the Liberal party, again under Gladstone's leadership, resolved to carry still further the reforms of 1832 and 1867, for over two million men, chiefly agricultural laborers, were denied the right to vote. By extending the suffrage to them the Liberals hoped to gain their support, to offset the control of the country districts which had hitherto been enjoyed by the Conservatives. The new law which they succeeded in passing provided that the franchise established for the larger towns in 1867 should be extended to all towns, and to the country districts as well, thus introducing general uniformity throughout the United Kingdom. While this measure seemed to establish something approaching the manhood suffrage already common on the Continent, many men were still excluded from voting, especially unmarried laborers who, owing to the low rents in England, did not pay as much as ten pounds (fifty dollars) a year for unfurnished lodgings.

**633. Woman Suffrage and the Reform Bill of 1917.** For twenty years the right to vote excited little attention, for the Conservatives were in power and were satisfied to leave things alone. But when the Liberal party was again called to the helm in 1906 it had to face not only the question of including more *men* among the voters but the much more novel demand that *women* also should be allowed to vote. The Industrial Revolution, by opening up new employments to women, gave them a certain kind of independence which they never had had before. During the latter part of the nineteenth century women were admitted to universities, and colleges began to be established for them as well as for men. All these things produced the demand that women be given the right to vote. The movement was of course by no means confined to England.

Parliament, however, in 1913, rejected a bill proposing a general reform of the suffrage, in which women should share. But the delay was only temporary, for in 1917, in the midst of the World War, Parliament passed a sweeping suffrage measure granting the vote to all adult males and to a large class of women over thirty years of age (see §§ 862-864 below).

## II. THE ENGLISH CABINET

**634. The Position of the English Sovereign.** These reforms, which permitted a large number of voters to select the members of the House of Commons, left untouched, apparently, the ancient and honorable institutions of the king and the House of Lords.<sup>1</sup> The sovereign was still crowned with traditional pomp; coins and proclamations still asserted that he ruled "by the grace of God"; and laws purported to be enacted "by the king's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Commons in Parliament assembled."<sup>2</sup> Justice was executed and the colonies governed in the name of the king. The term "royal" was still applied to the army, the navy, and the mail service, reserving, as a wit once remarked, the word "national" only for the public debt.

**635. Parliament really controls the English Government.** There was a time, of course, when sovereign power was really exercised by the king of England. Henry VIII, for example, appointed his own ministers and dismissed them at will. He made war and peace at his pleasure and exercised such an influence on the elections that Parliament was filled with his supporters. The long struggle, however, between the king and the Parliament in the seventeenth century, and the Revolution of 1688, which placed William and Mary on the throne, made Parliament the chief power in the English government. The king was still *legally* empowered to veto any bill passed by Parliament, but he never exercised this power. He had in reality only the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, and the right to warn. He could not permanently oppose the wishes of the majority in Parliament, for should he venture to do so, he could always be brought to terms by cutting off the appropriations necessary to conduct his government.

**636. The Cabinet.** The king of England must now act through a ministry composed of the heads of the various departments of the government, with the prime minister as their chief. The

<sup>1</sup> For recent attacks on the Lords see below, §§ 855-858.

<sup>2</sup> Prior to the Parliament Act of 1911 (§ 639 below) the formula ran as it had since the fourteenth century (Vol. I, § 557): "by and with the consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in Parliament assembled."



development of this ministry, which is known as the cabinet, has been described in an earlier chapter (§ 167). It was pretty firmly established under George I and George II, who were glad to let others manage the government for them. While the king nominally appoints the members of the cabinet, that body is in reality a committee selected from the party which has a majority in the House of Commons. The leader of the party which secures the majority in a parliamentary election is charged by the king with the task of naming the other cabinet ministers, who may be selected from among the lords as well as the commons. Thus, unlike the president of the United States and his cabinet, who in general communicate with Congress through written messages, the prime minister and the heads of departments in England themselves have seats in Parliament and are obliged therefore to present and defend their own proposals.

The cabinet drafts the more important measures to be laid before Parliament and presents its general program at the opening of each session of Parliament in the form of "the king's speech," which is read by the sovereign or his representative. In all matters




FIG. 88. THE RESIDENCE OF THE PRIME MINISTER, 10 DOWNING STREET, LONDON

The official residences of the prime minister of England and of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, respectively, are these two plain-looking buildings on a little street near the Parliament buildings, named after a Sir George Downing, who was a nephew of Governor John Winthrop of Massachusetts and a graduate of Harvard College. Downing was a strong partisan of Cromwell, but on the restoration of Charles II abandoned the principles "he had sucked in" in America and was rewarded for services by a gift of this land



the cabinet acts as a unit, and whenever a member cannot agree with the majority on an important point he is bound to resign. The cabinet, therefore, is always unanimous in its recommendations to Parliament and the country.<sup>1</sup>

**637. What a Defeated Cabinet does.** Whenever it happens that the House of Commons expresses its disapproval of the policy of the ministry, either by defeating an important measure or by a direct vote of censure, the cabinet is bound to do one of two things. It may resign in a body and thus give way to a new ministry made up from the opposite party. If, however, the ministers feel that their policy has popular support outside of Parliament, they may "go to the country"; that is, they may ask the king to dissolve the existing Parliament and order a new election in the hope that the people may indicate its approval of their policy by electing their supporters. The further action of the ministry is then determined by the outcome of the election. A failure to gain a majority is the signal for the resignation of the entire ministry and the transference of power to their opponents.

**638. Parliament Sensitive to Public Opinion.** As the members of the House of Commons are not elected for a definite term of years (though according to a law passed in 1911 elections must be held *at least* every five years), that body may be dissolved at any time for the purpose of securing an expression of the people's will on any important issue. It is thus clear that the British government is more sensitive to changes in public opinion than are governments where the members of the legislatures are chosen for a definite term of years. For example, in the United States, Congressmen are elected for two years and Senators for six; consequently when a crisis arises it usually has to be settled by men who were not chosen according to their views on that particular question, whereas in England a new election can be held to find out the opinion of the public on an especially important new issue.

<sup>1</sup> An interesting illustration of this is to be found in the story told of a prime minister of the middle of the century, Lord Melbourne. His cabinet was divided on the question of the duty on grain, and with his back against the door, he declared to them: "Now, is it to lower the price of corn, or isn't it? It does not matter much what we say, but mind, we must all say the same thing."

**639. The House of Lords Reformed (1911).** Nevertheless, the reader will naturally ask how it is that the British government could be so democratic and yet retain, in its upper house, a body of hereditary peers not responsible to the voters. The explanation is that the House of Commons, by reason of its ancient right of proposing all money bills, could control the king and force him, if necessary, to create enough new peers to pass any measure blocked by the House of Lords. In practice the king has not had to do more than threaten such a measure to bring the House of Lords to terms.

However, the House of Lords became increasingly unpopular with a large class in England. Its members for the most part took little or no interest in their duties and rarely attended the sessions. Finally the important Parliament Act of 1911 was passed, by which, under certain circumstances, the House of Commons may force a bill through in spite of the Lords (see §§ 855-858 below).

### III. FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND OPINION, AND REFORM OF THE CRIMINAL LAW

**640. Freedom of Discussion.** While England was transforming herself into a democracy by remodeling her Parliament, the people gradually gained the right freely to discuss political questions in the newspapers and in public meetings and to express religious opinions differing from those sanctioned by the government without thereby losing their chance of holding office.

**641. Taxes on Newspapers.** Freedom of the press from governmental censorship is commonly regarded as having been established in 1695 by the refusal of Parliament to renew an old law providing for such control. However, in times of disturbance the government adopted repressive measures, as, for instance, during the French Revolution and in 1819, when there was a good deal of disorder. Moreover the stamp duties on newspapers and advertisements hampered the publication of cheap newspapers spreading political information among the masses. The necessity

of paying an eight-cent tax on each copy made the average price of a newspaper fourteen cents, while the price of the *London Times* was eighteen cents. In addition to these stamp duties there was a special tax on paper, which increased its cost about 50 per cent.

**642. Freedom of the Press.** These "taxes on knowledge," as they were called, were attacked by those who advocated public schools and by the political reformers who wanted cheap newspapers through which to carry on agitation. At length, in 1833, the tax on advertisements, and in 1836 the stamp taxes, were reduced, bringing the price of most London papers down to ten cents. Twenty years later these taxes were swept away altogether, and in 1861 the duty on printing paper was removed, and thus England secured a free press. The government, however, did not give low postal rates to the newspapers as in the United States.

**643. Freedom of Speech.** Quite as important as freedom of the press was the right to hold public meetings and to criticize existing institutions. Progress comes through discussion and criticism. Government by political parties and public opinion is impossible without freedom of speech. The rise of the Whig and Tory parties, which were alternately in and out of power, gave England by the middle of the eighteenth century more freedom of speech than was enjoyed anywhere else in Europe. Nevertheless, in times of great excitement like the French Revolution the English government arrested and imprisoned men for demanding the mildest reforms or making the slightest criticism of the king or Parliament. During the agitation over manhood suffrage Parliament, in 1819, passed six drastic laws against freedom of speech and assembly. This legislation was violently opposed, and it was soon repealed.

By the middle of the nineteenth century the rule was established that anyone could say what he pleased about the government and existing institutions so long as he did not incite people immediately to violence. In 1861 the distinguished English lawyer Sir Erskine May could write: "However small a minority, however unpopular, irrational, eccentric, perverse, or unpatriotic its sentiments, however despised or pitied, it may speak

out fearlessly in full confidence of toleration. The majority, conscious of right and assured of its proper influence in the state, neither fears nor resents opposition." When during the World War rather harsh restraints were again laid upon freedom of speech, they were regarded as extraordinary measures, temporarily setting aside the established principle of freedom.



FIG. 89. WESTMINSTER ABBEY, LONDON

Westminster Abbey is the famous church in which are buried the most distinguished statesmen, authors, artists, and scientists, of England. It stands on the site of a church founded in Anglo-Saxon times, but the present building dates mainly from later centuries, the last notable addition having been added by the fifteenth century. The tombs of Chatham, Pitt, Beaconsfield, Gladstone, and other great statesmen lie just inside the door shown in the picture. The Parliament buildings stand just across the street from the church, to the left of the picture (see Fig. 86)

**644. Establishment of Religious Liberty (1828-1829).** It was natural that, in the midst of this general movement for political liberty and freedom of the press, the Dissenters and Catholics should have put in a claim for the abolition of the laws which placed them under many disadvantages. The Dissenters, although they enjoyed a certain liberty of religious worship, were excluded from city offices and from all places of trust, civil and military, in the government, although, curiously enough, they were not



forbidden to sit in Parliament—from which Catholics were excluded in addition to other public offices. The rapid increase of the dissenting sects in wealth, numbers, and influence, especially after the appearance of the Methodists (§§ 119–120), at last forced Parliament to attend to their demand, and in 1828 the old laws against them were repealed, and they were admitted freely to public offices on condition that they would take an oath “upon the true faith of a Christian” not to use their influence to injure or weaken the Established Church.

The following year the Catholics secured the passage of the famous “Emancipation Act,” which admitted them to both houses of Parliament and to practically all municipal and government offices, upon condition that they would take an oath renouncing the *temporal* supremacy of the Pope and disclaiming any intention of injuring the Protestant religion.

**645. Religion and the Schools.** These reforms by no means took religious controversies out of politics in England, for the religious sects continued at war over the question as to who should control the schools. Anglicans, Catholics, and Dissenters during the nineteenth century built schoolhouses and maintained schools of their own, and when the demand for free public schools became so strong that in 1870 the government provided for the erection and equipment of schools at public expense, religious bodies began to contend among themselves for representation on the school boards having charge of the government schools.

All the sects agreed that education without religious instruction was bad, but they differed hotly on the particular kind of religious instruction that should be given. The problem of how to satisfy the demands of the several bitterly contending sects has constituted one of the main issues of English politics up to the present time. Nevertheless, the efficiency of the schools steadily increased, and there was a corresponding decline in illiteracy. In 1843, 32 per cent of the men and 49 per cent of the women had to sign their names in the marriage registers with a cross. In 1903 only 2 per cent of the men and 3 per cent of the women were unable to write their own names in the registers.

**646. Cruel Criminal Laws Reformed.** While some reformers were busy with securing freedom of the press and removing religious "disabilities," others were attacking the criminal law, which, at the opening of the nineteenth century, as an English writer has observed, sacrificed the lives of men with a reckless barbarity worthier of an Eastern despot than of a Christian state. This cruel code included no less than two hundred and fifty offenses for which the death penalty was imposed. It is estimated that between 1810 and 1845 there were fourteen hundred executions for acts which were not regarded as capital offenses after the latter date.

It required many years of agitation, however, to move the British Parliament, and although some of the worst abuses were got rid of in the third decade of the century, the list of capital offenses was not reduced to three until 1861.

**647. Prison Reform.** In 1835, after a parliamentary investigation had revealed the horrible conditions of prisons, a law was passed providing for government inspection and the improvement of their administration, and this marked the beginning of prison reform, which includes sanitary buildings, separation of the sexes, separation of the hardened criminals from the younger offenders, and a more enlightened treatment of criminals generally, with a view to reforming them<sup>1</sup> while protecting society.

#### IV. SOCIAL REFORMS

**648. Wretchedness of Life in the English Factories.** The cruelty of the criminal law had its origin in the Middle Ages, but with the coming of the Industrial Revolution in the reign of George III new forms of inhumanity had arisen. These were the result of the factory system, which brought untold misery to the working classes of England. Great factory buildings were hastily erected by men ignorant of the most elementary knowledge of

<sup>1</sup> It should be stated that the attitude of the English toward such matters as crime and its punishment was shared by the other nations as well (§§ 144-145), although no place can be found in this history to describe these reforms. The proper treatment of criminals and the causes of crime are still subjects but little understood.

health precautions and often too avaricious to care for anything except sufficient space in which to operate the machines and sufficient light to enable the laborers to do their work. To these industrial centers flocked thousands of landless and homeless men and women entirely dependent upon the factory owners for the opportunity to earn their daily bread. Falling off of business caused long periods of enforced idleness, which resulted in great uncertainty in the life of the workman.

**649. Child Labor.** The introduction of steam-driven machinery had made possible the use of child labor on a large scale, and it was the condition of the children which first attracted the attention of philanthropists and reformers. Thousands of little paupers were taken from the poorhouses and nominally apprenticed, but practically sold, to the proprietors of the factories. Necessity or greed on the part of parents and the demand for "cheap labor" on the part of manufacturers brought thousands of other children into the factories.

**650. Misery of the Factory Hands and Miners.** The conditions of adult labor, save in the most skilled classes, were almost as wretched as those of child labor. Women and girls were employed in great numbers in mills and even in the dark and dangerous tunnels of the mines, which were badly ventilated and perilous to work in; dangerous machinery was not properly safeguarded, and the working time was excessively prolonged. The misery of the poor is reflected in Mrs. Browning's poem "The Cry of the Children," in the bitter scorn which Carlyle poured out on the heads of the factory owners, in the impassioned pages of Kingsley's *Alton Locke*, and in Dickens's touching stories of the poor.

**651. The Dispute over Factory Legislation.** The working classes were excluded from representation in Parliament, they were denied opportunities for education, and the statesmen of the time refused to take action in their behalf until after long and violent agitation. In this refusal Parliament was supported by many political economists, who defended the rights of factory owners as writers had defended the divine right of kings. These theorists believed that government interference with industry or commerce

would only make matters worse, since the business men knew what was good for their business better than members of Parliament. If capitalists were obliged to shorten hours of labor, they claimed that it would make profits impossible, thus closing the factories and bringing still greater hardships for the workers.

**652. Early Factory Laws.** The result of such a theory was that during the first thirty years of the nineteenth century the government did almost nothing to remedy conditions. In 1802 an act reduced the hours of pauper children in cotton mills to seventy-two per week and made some other reforms, such as compelling employers to furnish at least one suit of clothes a year. But even this act was not enforced and conditions remained as bad as ever. From 1815 to 1819 Robert Owen, the great philanthropist (§ 445), labored to secure a better law for the protection of children. He had shown by the conduct of his own factories the advantage of treating employees well, and appealed to other manufacturers to help secure such conditions in the mills as would produce healthier and happier workers. But his appeal fell on deaf ears, and the bill he finally got passed was but a slight part of his demands. It only forbade the employment of children under nine in the cotton mills and limited the working time of those between nine and sixteen to twelve hours per day.

**653. Parliament at last adopts Reforms (1832-1842).** During the following years, however, ardent reformers, disregarding the advice of the theorists, and discontented workmen, filling the country with unrest, at last forced Parliament to undertake to improve conditions. Indeed, the bad ventilation, scanty food, long hours, and lack of sanitation led to the spread of epidemics in the factory districts, and action could not longer be delayed without endangering the health of the well-to-do. The appalling disclosures of a parliamentary commission appointed in 1832 resulted in a new bill still further reducing the working hours for children and providing for the first time for regular factory inspectors. In 1842 Lord Ashley carried through Parliament a mining law which forbade the employment of women and children in underground occupations.



**654. The Ten-Hour Day.** These laws did not satisfy the reformers, and they now began to work for another measure, restricting the labor of women and children in mills to ten hours per day exclusive of mealtimes. This proposition gave rise to a heated contest in the House of Commons between manufacturers and landed proprietors. In vain did John Bright (champion of the abolition of slavery in the United States) denounce the proposition as "most injurious and destructive to the best interests of the country," "a delusion practiced upon the working classes," and "one of the worst measures ever passed." In 1847 the ten-hour bill for women and children became a law. In practice it applied to the men as well, for the mills could not run after the women and children had stopped working.

**655. A Summary View of Labor Legislation.** With this great victory for the reformers the general resistance to state interference was broken down, and year after year, through the long reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901) and those of her successors, new measures were carried through Parliament, revising and supplementing earlier laws, until England was doing more than any other European country to protect the factory operatives. In the language of Lord Morley, England established "a complete, minute, voluminous code for the protection of labor; buildings must be kept clear of effluvia; dangerous machinery must be fenced; children and young persons must not clean it while in motion; their hours are not only limited but fixed; continuous employment must not exceed a given number of hours, varying with the trade, but prescribed by law in given cases; a statutable number of holidays is imposed; the children must go to school, and the employer must every week have a certificate to that effect; if an accident happens, notice must be sent to the proper authorities; special provisions are made for bakehouses, for lacemaking, for collieries, and for a whole schedule of other special callings; for the due enforcement and vigilant supervision of this code of minute prescriptions there is an immense host of inspectors, certifying surgeons, and other authorities, whose business it is to 'speed and post o'er land and ocean' in restless guardianship of every kind of

labor, from that of the woman who plaits straw at her cottage door to the miner who descends into the bowels of the earth, and the seaman who conveys the fruits and materials of universal industry to and fro between the remotest parts of the globe."

Important as are the measures thus summarized, far more revolutionary legislation for the working class was enacted during the opening years of the twentieth century than during the entire nineteenth century (§§ 844 ff.).

## V. FREE TRADE

**656. The Old System of Protection.** From the fourteenth century onward England endeavored, by high tariffs, navigation laws (§§ 77-78), and numerous other measures, to protect her manufacturers, farmers, and shipowners against foreign competition. Special tariffs were imposed on the manufactured goods of other countries; bounties were paid from the government treasury to encourage various forms of commercial enterprise; Englishmen were obliged to import their goods from the colonies in English ships, no matter how much cheaper they could get them carried by Dutch merchantmen; and high duties were imposed on grain.

Adam Smith and other economists denounced this system of protection, claiming that it hampered commerce and consequently injured industry as well. However, the free-trade movement which in the middle of the nineteenth century opened British markets freely to the products of all nations was mainly the work of the owners of the new factories, who objected to the tariffs on grain, which, they argued, made the bread of their workmen dear. They contended, as well, that undeveloped countries like Russia or America would be happy to buy English cloth, shoes, and cutlery if they could send to England, in return, a portion of their great crops of wheat, rye, oats, and barley without having to reckon with import duties. Having little fear of foreign competition in their industries, and owning no land, they wanted no protection for themselves or the farmers.

**657. The "Corn" Laws Attacked.** The manufacturers began, therefore, to attack the Corn Laws,<sup>1</sup> as the tariff acts protecting grain were called. The duties on grain had been made especially high after 1815, when the fall of the inflated war prices threatened to ruin the farmers.

To secure the repeal of these duties on grain and to propagate the principles of free trade generally, the manufacturers founded in 1838 the Anti-Corn-Law League, and for almost ten years this organization, under the brilliant leadership of Richard Cobden and John Bright, carried on one of the most thoroughgoing campaigns of popular education in the history of democracy, expending in one year over a million dollars in publications and meetings. The attack was concentrated on the Corn Laws because it was easier to rouse feeling against the landlords than in favor of any theories of political economy. It was a war on the landed aristocracy.

**658. Peel carries the Repeal of the Corn Laws (1846).** The agitation was brought to a crisis in 1845 by a failure of crops in England and a potato famine in Ireland, which raised the price of foodstuffs enormously and brought thousands to the verge of starvation, especially in Ireland. In the midst of such distress it appeared to thinking men nothing short of criminal to maintain high prices of grain by law. Consequently Sir Robert Peel, then prime minister, determined that the Corn Laws must go, in spite of the fact that he had hitherto defended them, and in 1846 he succeeded in carrying through Parliament a law which led to their practical repeal. Though compelled to resign immediately after the passage of this bill, Peel had given the whole protective system in England its death blow, since it was chiefly the tariff on grain that could claim any really active defenders.

**659. Free Trade Established (1852-1867).** Within ten years all the old navigation laws were abolished and English ports were opened freely to the ships of other nations. Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1852, removed the duties on one hundred and twenty-three articles entirely and reduced them on

<sup>1</sup> The term "corn," usually confined to Indian corn, or maize, in the United States, is commonly used in England to mean *grain* in general.

one hundred and thirty-three more. On his return to office, some fifteen years later, he made a clean sweep of all *protective* duties, retaining, for revenue purposes, those on tea, wines, cocoa, and a few other articles.

**660. Question of Free Trade in Other Countries.** The tendency toward free trade was not confined to England. Indeed, until the seventies, it looked as if a network of commercial treaties, combined with low tariffs, would carry all Europe into a free-trade policy. The Liberals in France under Napoleon III favored it, and, as we have seen, Germany had accepted it in a modified form until Bismarck's tariff law of 1879 (§ 568). At last, however, a reaction set in. The protectionists rose to power in the continental countries; the United States converted what was once regarded as a temporary policy of encouraging infant industries and of increasing the revenue during the Civil War into a permanent policy of high protection; and foreign competitors, having free access to England's markets, began to undersell her at home as well as abroad.

**661. Revival of Protectionist Ideas.** This radical change in the economic conditions in the continental countries and the United States convinced many Englishmen that some alteration would have to be made in England's free-trade policy. On the other hand, some thoughtful people felt that protective tariffs are really a sort of commercial warfare, which must be done away with if permanent peace, good will, and coöperation are to be established among civilized nations, now so dependent on one another for their prosperity.

## VI. THE IRISH QUESTION

**662. The Irish Question.** In addition to the important problems the English have had to solve at home they have been constantly involved in perplexities in their dealings with the Irish, who belong to the Celtic race and the Roman Catholic faith and differ essentially from their English neighbors in sentiments and traditions. The principal troubles with Ireland have been over the land question, religious differences, and Home Rule.



**663. How the English have seized Irish Land.** The first of these questions, the land question, grew out of the fact that Ireland had been frequently invaded by the English, and Irish estates given to English warriors, fortune hunters, and royal favorites. These invasions dated back to the twelfth century, when, under Henry II (1154-1189), certain eastern districts around Dublin were wrested from the Irish. In the sixteenth century, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, revolts of the Irish led to new conquests, particularly of Ulster in the north. Under James I Protestant colonists from Scotland and England were settled in Ulster, adding a permanent cause of discord.

**664. Irish Rebellions; the Orangemen.** A little later, when the Puritans in England were fighting Charles I, the Catholic Irish rose in revolt, but as they were hopelessly divided into factions, Oliver Cromwell's well-disciplined army crushed them all. Cromwell took terrible and bloody vengeance, scourging the country with fire and sword and confiscating more land. During the English Revolution of 1688 the Irish again rose for their Catholic king, James II, and attempted to drive the Protestants out. Finally William III defeated James at a battle by the river Boyne, July 1, 1690. The Ulster Protestants annually celebrate this deliverance by "William of Orange," and their lodges of "Orangemen" keep alive the spirit of opposition to the Irish Catholics and the fear of what might happen if they got control of the country.<sup>1</sup>

**665. Evil of Absentee Landlordism.** The result of these unsuccessful rebellions was that still more lands were taken from the Irish. Now the English landlords, to whom these estates were given, and their descendants, for the most part, lived in England. In the nineteenth century millions of pounds yearly were drained away from Ireland to pay "absentee" landlords, who rarely set foot in that country and took little or no interest in their tenants beyond the collection of their rents. If the tenants did not pay or could not pay, they were speedily deprived of their cottages and lands. It was estimated in 1847 that about one third of the entire rental of Ireland was paid to English landlords.

<sup>1</sup> The first Orange lodges date from 1795, but the movement began earlier.

**666. The Condition of the Peasantry.** Throughout large portions of Ireland the peasants were constantly on the verge of starvation. They were deprived of nearly all inducement to work at the improvement of their little holdings, because they were liable to be evicted and lose the results of their own labors. In spite of the bad conditions the population was rapidly increasing, so whenever there was a failure of the potato crop, on which from one third to one half the population depended for food, there were scenes of misery in Ireland which defy description. This was the case in the "Black Year of Forty-Seven," when the potato crop failed almost entirely and thousands died of starvation in spite of the relief afforded by the government. It was in the midst of this terrible famine that the stream of emigration began to flow toward America. Within half a century four million emigrants left the shores of Ireland for other countries, principally the United States, taking with them their bitter resentment against England.

**667. Position of the English Church in Ireland.** The second source of trouble in Ireland was the English Church. When England adopted the Protestant faith an attempt was made to force it upon the Irish, who, however, clung steadfastly to the Pope and their ancient Church. The monasteries were suppressed and their lands confiscated. Catholic clergy were expelled from their parishes and Protestant priests installed in their places, to be supported by tithes collected from a people still loyal to their old faith. Even in the darkest days of the nineteenth century, when Irish peasants were starving, the English Church in Ireland continued to draw its ample revenues from the tithes and endowments, although its members numbered but one tenth of the population. These tithes, however, were collected from the peasants only with the utmost difficulty, and pitched battles were sometimes fought between them and the police when the latter undertook to drive off the last cow to pay the dues to the hated Church of England clergyman.

**668. Disestablishment of the English Church in Ireland.** It is small wonder, therefore, that the Irish were deeply embittered over the religious question and began a movement to

overthrow the Anglican Church in their midst. By the Catholic Emancipation Act, mentioned above (§ 644), Irish Catholics, along with the English Catholics, had been admitted to Parliament, as well as to other public offices; and they carried on an agitation which ended in 1869 in the passage of an act by Parliament which "disestablished" the English Church in Ireland and abolished its tithes. The Anglicans, however, were allowed to retain the beautiful



FIG. 90. IRISH COTTAGES

The pictures show the contrast between the quaint, but filthy and unhealthful, old thatched cottages of Ireland and the clean and comfortable, if unpicturesque, new ones. The American traveler often regrets the disappearance of these old houses from the landscape of the Old World, but wherever the peasantry of Europe is prosperous, it is replacing picturesqueness by comfort.

Hence much of the Old World looks as new as America

buildings which had been seized during the period of the Reformation, and the clergy were recompensed for the loss of the tithes by a large grant of money from the government.

Although the burden of the tithes was thus removed from the peasants, the evils of absentee landlordism remained; and finding themselves victorious in the struggle against the Anglican Church they undertook an agitation for thorough land reform.

**669. Parnell and the Land League (1879).** In 1879 a great Land League, with Charles Stewart Parnell, a member of Parliament, at its head, was established with the aim of securing three things for the Irish peasant—fair rent, fixed holding, and fair sale; that is to say, they asked for legislation providing that the



rent should not be fixed by the landlord at any amount he thought he could get, but by a court taking into consideration the fair value of the land; that the tenant should hold his land as long as he paid the rent so fixed; and finally that, in case he surrendered his holding, he should be allowed to sell his improvements to the tenant who succeeded him.

**670. The Irish Land Acts (1881-1903).** Parnell, with the support of the Irish members in Parliament, resorted to "filibustering" until that body was forced, in 1881, to pass a land act granting these three demands. This measure has been supplemented by land-purchase acts by which the government puts at the disposal of the tenants money to buy their holdings, with the privilege of repayment on the installment plan. One of these acts, passed in 1903, appropriates a practically unlimited amount for this purpose and offers a considerable inducement to landlords to sell, so that the land question seems in a fair way to be settled to the satisfaction of the peasantry.<sup>1</sup>

**671. Ireland united with England (1801).** The third source of trouble between England and Ireland has been the contest over Home Rule. Until 1801 Ireland had maintained a separate parliament of her own; but in that year the English government determined to suppress it, as a result of an uprising in 1798 led by Wolfe Tone, a Protestant who had imbibed republican principles in France. The Act of Union of 1801 abolished the Irish parliament and provided that Ireland should be represented by one hundred members in the House of Commons, and in the House of Lords by twenty-eight peers chosen by the Irish nobility.

**672. Home-Rule Agitation.** This Act of Union was resented by the Irish patriots. Accordingly, they at once began an agitation for Home Rule; that is, for a parliament of their own in which they could legislate on their own affairs instead of being forced to rely upon the British Parliament, where the English and the

<sup>1</sup> The Land-Purchase Act of 1885, passed by Lord Salisbury, set apart twenty-five million dollars; that of 1888, a second sum of the same amount; that of 1891 devoted one hundred and seventy million dollars to the purchase of lands, and that of 1903 an almost unlimited sum.



Scotch had an overwhelming majority. The repeal of the Act of Union was warmly urged by Daniel O'Connell after the Catholic emancipation of 1829 (§ 644), and at the general election of 1834 forty members of Parliament favored Home Rule. A Repeal Association was organized, large meetings were arranged by O'Connell, and the examples of Belgium and Greece in winning independence were cited as indications of what the Irish might do. All Ireland seemed on the verge of rebellion, and Irish Americans planned an invasion of Canada. The British government met this agitation by stationing thirty-five thousand troops in the island, and O'Connell, in spite of his violent and inflammatory speeches, shrank from the possibility of civil war.

**673. Gladstone espouses the Cause of Irish Home Rule (1886).** O'Connell died in 1847, but the cause of Home Rule did not perish with him, for it was taken up by the Fenians and the Land League, who inaugurated a reign of terror for the landlords and thus kept steadily before the people. In 1882 the shocking murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish, the chief minister for Ireland, and his secretary took place in Phoenix Park, Dublin. This deed aroused the attention of the civilized world and convinced Gladstone that nothing short of Home Rule could solve the perennial Irish problem. After the parliamentary election of 1886, which gave him a small majority in the Commons and made him dependent upon the Irish members for their support, he undertook to secure the repeal of the Act of Union. Many of his followers, who did not believe in the policy of Home Rule, broke away from his leadership and formed the party of the Liberal *Unionists*, thus defeating the bill by about thirty votes. Seven years later Gladstone brought forward a new Home Rule bill providing that the Irish should have a parliament of their own at Dublin and also have representatives in that of the United Kingdom. This bill, though passed by the Commons, was rejected by the House of Lords.

**674. The Irish Question again becomes Serious (1914).** After the failure of Gladstone's Home Rule Bill in 1893 the Irish question fell into the background for a time. But in 1914 Parliament




FIG. 91. GLADSTONE ADDRESSING THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The picture shows Gladstone, at the age of eighty-two, introducing the Home Rule Bill of 1893. The House of Commons is crowded with the most distinguished men of the day. Note how it is divided into opposing rows of benches, the party in power holding those on the right, the opposition party those on the left, of the Speaker, who sits in the thronelike chair, clad in quaint robes and wearing a wig, as do the clerks in front of him



at last passed an Irish bill that seemed about to lead to civil war, owing to the opposition of Ulster. Then during the World War a Republican party, the *Sinn Fein*, appeared and declared that Ireland should be and was altogether independent of England. These later developments will be discussed in Chapter XXVI (see §§ 865-867 below).

### QUESTIONS

I. Give an account of the political situation in England at the opening of the nineteenth century. What were the "rotten boroughs"? Who enjoyed the right to vote? Describe an election before the introduction of the secret ballot. Discuss the attempts made to secure parliamentary reform before 1832.

Describe the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832. State the provisions of the bill. Outline the history of the Chartist movement. Sketch the course of parliamentary reform from 1848 to 1884, giving the terms of the bills of 1867 and 1884. What problems connected with the extension of the franchise were left to be solved?

II. What powers does the king of England possess? What is the English cabinet? Describe the method of selecting cabinet officers; the manner in which the cabinet acts. What is meant by the "rise and fall of ministries"?

For what reason is the English government said to be more under the influence of public opinion than that of the United States? What effect did the Parliament Act of 1911 have upon the power of the House of Lords?

III. What were the "taxes on knowledge"? When were they abolished? Do you believe in free speech? When and by what means was religious liberty secured by Dissenters and Roman Catholics? Describe the criminal-law system at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the reforms instituted after the parliamentary investigation of 1835.

IV. Give a brief account of the abuses of the factory system. Account for the opposition to factory legislation. Outline the history of factory legislation.

V. Discuss the policy of protection in England. Give the arguments of those who favored free trade. Indicate the steps by which free trade was established. What is the present-day feeling about the free-trade policy?



VI. Outline the history of England's relations with Ireland from the twelfth to the eighteenth century. What have been the three sources of trouble between England and Ireland in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries? What attempts have been made to remove these causes of discontent in each case? What do you know of recent events in Ireland?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) parliamentary reform in England, pp. 239-258; (2) the English cabinet system, pp. 258-266; (3) growth of political and religious freedom, pp. 270-278; (4) social reforms, pp. 279-292; (5) the Irish question, pp. 292-305.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Lord John Russell, Chartism, Queen Victoria, William E. Gladstone, Benjamin Disraeli, Parliament, Factory Legislation, Free Trade, Charles Stewart Parnell, and Home Rule.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) political reform in England, pp. 278-290; (2) the government and parties of the United Kingdom, pp. 290-307; (3) social legislation, pp. 307-319; (4) the British question, pp. 319-326. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (5) fifty years of political and social reform, pp. 57-81; (6) romantic and Victorian literature, pp. 81-88; (7) government and politics of England, pp. 324-342; (8) the labor and the land questions, pp. 342-355; (9) recent social reform in England, pp. 355-371; (10) recent English literature, pp. 372-381; (11) the Irish question, pp. 382-398.

# BOOK VI. MERGING OF EUROPEAN HISTORY INTO WORLD HISTORY

## CHAPTER XX

### THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE AND THE SPREAD OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

#### I. HOW THE PEOPLES OF THE GLOBE HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TOGETHER BY IMPROVED MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

**675. The Foreign Trade of Europe.** As a result of the Industrial Revolution (see above, Chapter XII), Europe became a busy world of shops and factories, which tended to produce much more than Europeans could use. So new markets have been constantly sought in distant parts of the world. The trade with the Far East, which, as we have seen, led to the discovery of America, grew during the nineteenth century to an enormous extent, scattering the wares of London, Paris, or Hamburg through China and India and the islands of the Pacific. This world trade is one of the great facts of history, for it led the European nations to plant new colonies and to try to monopolize markets in Asia and Africa and wherever else they could. This brought rivalries between the nations at home, and it was one of the causes of the great European war.

**676. Beginnings of Steam Navigation; Robert Fulton.** This prodigious expansion of commerce was made possible by the discovery that steam could be used to carry goods cheaply and speedily to all parts of the earth. Steamships and railways have made the world one great market place.

The problem of applying steam to navigation had long occupied inventors, but the honor of making the steamship a success

commercially belongs to Robert Fulton. In the spring of 1807 he launched his *Clermont* at New York, and in the autumn of that year the "new water monster" made its famous trip to Albany. Transoceanic steam navigation began in 1819 with the voyage of the steamer *Savannah* from Savannah to Liverpool, which took twenty-five days, sails being used to help the engine.




FIG 92. THE *SAVANNAH*

The *Great Western*, which startled the world in 1838 by steaming from Bristol to New York in fifteen days and ten hours, was a ship of 1378 tons, 212 feet long, with a daily consumption of 36 tons of coal.<sup>1</sup> Now a commercial map of the world shows that the globe is crossed in every direction by definite routes which are followed by innumerable freight and passenger steamers passing regularly from one port to another, and few of all these thousands of ships are as small as the famous *Great Western*.

**677.** The Suez Canal completed in 1869. The East and the West have been brought much nearer together by the piercing of

<sup>1</sup> Compare this with the *Mauretania*, with a tonnage of 32,500 tons, engines of 68,000 horse power, 785 feet long, and carrying a supply of over 5000 tons of coal for its journey across the Atlantic, which lasted less than five days. A German vessel, the *Imperator*, was launched in 1912, having a tonnage of over 50,000 tons.

the Isthmus of Suez, which formerly barred the way from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean. This enterprise was carried out under the direction of the great French engineer Ferdinand de Lesseps. After ten years of work the canal was opened to traffic in November, 1869. Now annually over five thousand vessels take advantage of it, thus avoiding the long voyage around the Cape of Good Hope.

**678. Panama Canal.** The construction of a canal through the Isthmus of Panama was undertaken in 1881 by a French company organized by de Lesseps. But those promoting the enterprise were guilty of wholesale bribery of members of the French parliament, and the work itself was mismanaged. This was disclosed in 1892, and the scandal led to the dissolution of the company. In 1902 the Congress of the United States authorized the President to purchase for forty million dollars the property in which the French investors had sunk so much money. Arrangements with the republic of Colombia for the construction of the canal by the United States having come to naught, the state of Panama, through which the line of the proposed canal passes, seceded from Colombia in 1903, and its independence was immediately recognized by President Roosevelt. A treaty in regard to the canal zone was then duly concluded with the new republic, and after some delays the work of the French company was resumed by the United States and practically completed in 1915.

**679. Steam Railways; Stephenson.** Just as the gigantic modern steamship has taken the place of the schooner for the rapid trade of the world, so, on land, the merchandise which used to be dragged by means of horses and oxen or carried in slow canal boats is being transported in long trains of capacious cars, each of which holds as much as fifteen or twenty large wagons. The story of the locomotive, like that of the spinning machine or steam engine, is the history of many experiments and their final combination by a successful inventor, George Stephenson (1781-1848).

In 1814 Stephenson built a small locomotive, known as "Puffing Billy," which was used at the mines, and in 1825, with the authorization of Parliament, he opened between Stockton and



Darlington, in the northern part of England, a line for the conveyance of passengers and freight. About this time a road was being projected between Liverpool and Manchester, and in an open competition, in which five locomotives were entered, Stephenson's *Rocket* was chosen for the new railroad, which was formally opened in 1830. This famous engine weighed about seven




FIG. 93. A LOCOMOTIVE BUILT BY GEORGE STEPHENSON

tons and ran at an average speed of thirteen miles an hour—a small affair when compared with the giant locomotive of our day, weighing a hundred tons and running fifty miles an hour.<sup>1</sup> Within fifteen years trains were running regularly between Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and

London, and at the close of the nineteenth century Great Britain had twenty-two thousand miles of railway carrying over a billion passengers annually.

**680. Rapid Introduction of Railroads.** The first railway was opened in France in 1828, the first in Germany in 1835, but the development of the system was greatly hindered by the territorial divisions which then existed. Now Europe is bound together by a network of over two hundred thousand miles of railway.

Railway construction has also been rapidly advancing in Africa and Asia, preparing cheap outlets for the products of Western mills and mines. The Trans-Siberian road, connecting Europe overland with the Pacific, was completed in 1900 (§ 750 below), and Russia pushed lines southward toward Persia and Afghanistan;

<sup>1</sup> It will be noted that this is the average speed on regular runs. For short distances the *Rocket* made thirty-five miles an hour, while the modern locomotive, as is well known, sometimes runs over a hundred miles an hour.

British India has some thirty-five thousand miles. Even Africa has been penetrated, and now trains run many thousands of miles through forest, plain, and jungle, where no white man had ever gone before the nineteenth century. These railroads are of the greatest importance, for those who own them are placed in a position to control, to a very large degree, the economic or even the political life of the regions through which they pass. Therefore, as we shall see, the various European nations have been jealous of each other's railroad enterprises in the undeveloped countries. For instance, the importance of the new railroads in China and Turkey was so great as to involve the rival European nations interested in them and so contribute a cause of war.<sup>1</sup>

**681. The Penny Post.** Quite as essential to the world market as railway and steamship lines are the easy and inexpensive means of communication afforded by the post, telephone, telegraph, and cable. The English "penny post" is now so commonplace as no longer to excite wonder, but to men of Frederick the Great's time it would have seemed impossible. Until 1839 in England the postage on an ordinary letter was a shilling for a short distance, and the cost varied with the distance sent. In that year a reform measure long advocated by Rowland Hill was carried, establishing a uniform penny post throughout Great Britain. The result of reducing the rate of postage to this nominal sum surprised everyone in vastly increasing the frequency with which people wrote to one another. Moreover, by cheapening the rate for sending mail, newspapers were circulated all over the earth, and people were able to lead more intelligent lives. Other European countries followed the example of Great Britain in reducing postage, and one could soon send a letter to almost any part of the world for five cents. Already letters may be carried from China to New York for two cents in less time than it took news to cross the Atlantic when penny postage was introduced.

<sup>1</sup> The Japanese and Russians have used the railways of Manchuria to establish themselves along the route. The German concession from Turkey of a railroad from Constantinople to Bagdad was very unwelcome to English and Russians. The United States has the greatest railroad systems in the world, extending over two hundred and fifty thousand miles.

**682. The Telegraph and Telephone.** No less wonderful is the development of the telegraph, submarine cables, and telephone systems, the former an invention of 1837, the latter as recent as 1876.<sup>1</sup> Distant and obscure places in Africa and Asia are being brought into close touch with one another and with Europe. China now has lines connecting all the important cities of the republic and affording direct overland communication between Peking and Paris. In October, 1907, Marconi established regular communication across the Atlantic by means of the wireless system of telegraphy discovered some years before; and now the wireless telephone can carry the voice from Washington to Hawaii, and the radio, music from London to Cape Town.

## II. TRADE COMPETITION; IMPERIALISM; RÔLE OF THE MISSIONARIES

**683. Competition for Foreign Markets.** The Industrial Revolution which enabled Europe to produce far more goods than it could sell in its own markets, and the rapid transportation which permitted business men to distribute their commodities over the whole surface of the globe, combined to produce a keen competition for foreign markets. The European nations secured the control of practically all the territory occupied by defenseless peoples in Africa and Asia, and introduced Western ideas of business into China and Japan, where steamships now ply the navigable rivers and railroads are being rapidly built.

The process of colonization and of Westernizing the oriental peoples was further hastened by European and American capitalists, investing in railroads and mines in backward countries. At the opening of the twentieth century, Great Britain alone had about ten billion dollars invested abroad; one fifth of Russian industrial enterprises were financed by foreigners, who were also to a considerable extent constructing the railroads in China. The

<sup>1</sup> The electric-telegraph instrument was invented in America by Morse and in England by Cooke and Wheatstone at the same time. Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone just in time to exhibit it at the Centennial Exposition, celebrating one hundred years of American independence, in Philadelphia, 1876.

Germans supplied the money for large banking concerns in Brazil, Buenos Aires, and Valparaiso, which in turn stimulated industry and the construction of railways.

**684. Various Forms of Imperialism.** These two powerful forces—factories seeking markets and capital seeking investment—influenced the decisions of statesmen in every important European country. They alone explain why the great manufacturing nations embarked on what has been termed a policy of *imperialism*, which means a policy of adding distant territories for the purpose of controlling their products, getting the trade with the natives, and investing money in the development of natural resources. Sometimes this imperialism took the form of outright annexation at the desire of the natives, such as the acquisition of Hawaii by the United States. Again, it assumed the form of a “protectorate,” which is a declaration on the part of a nation somewhat as follows: “This is our particular piece of land; we are not intending to take all the responsibility of governing it just now; but we want other nations to keep out, for we may annex it sooner or later.” Sometimes imperialism went no farther than the securing of concessions in undeveloped countries, such as foreigners obtained in China or citizens of the United States in Mexico.

**685. The Missionary as an Agent of Imperialism.** The way for imperialism was smoothed by the missionaries. There have always been ardent Christians ready to obey the command “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark xvi, 15). No sooner was a new country brought to the attention of Europeans than missionaries flocked thither with the traders and soldiers. When America was discovered and the sea route opened to the East, the Franciscan and Dominican friars braved every danger to bring the gospel to them that sat in darkness. They were reënforced about 1540 by the powerful Jesuit order (Vol. I, §§ 774-777).

In 1622 the great missionary board of the Roman Catholic Church was given its final organization. It has its headquarters at Rome. In its colleges and schools missionaries are trained



for their work and taught the requisite languages. The Roman Catholic Church now reckons millions of adherents in Turkey, Persia, Arabia, India, Siam, Indo-China, Malaysia, the Chinese Republic, Korea, Japan, Africa, and Polynesia.

**686. Protestant Missions.** For a long time after the Protestant Revolt the reformed churches showed little ardor for foreign missions. The Dutch undertook to Christianize the East Indies in 1602, and their rivals, the English, also did something to promote missions. Among the earliest Protestant missionary associations was the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, founded in 1695 and conducted under the auspices of the Church of England. In the eighteenth century the Methodists and Baptists joined in the efforts to convert the heathen. The United States entered the field in 1810, when the American Board of Foreign Missions was organized. As time went on, practically all the Protestant denominations established each its board of foreign missions, and the United States rivaled Europe in the distinction and energy of the missionaries it sent out. Bible societies engaged in translating the Scriptures into every known language and scattering copies of them broadcast.

**687. Missionaries as Civilizers and Teachers.** Missionaries not alone spread the knowledge of the Christian religion, but carried with them modern scientific ideas and modern inventions. They reduced to writing the languages of peoples previously ignorant of the existence of an alphabet. They conquered cruel superstitions, extirpated human sacrifices and cannibalism, and have done much to make the lot of woman more tolerable. Their physicians introduced rational methods of treating the sick, and their schools have given an education to millions who without them would have been left in complete barbarism. Finally, they have encouraged thousands of Japanese, Chinese, and representatives of other peoples to visit Europe and America and thus prepare themselves to become apostles of Western ideas among their fellows. The explorations and investigations carried on by the missionaries also vastly increased the knowledge of the world and its inhabitants. Their maps and their scientific reports on languages

and customs often proved of the highest value. They also created a demand for Western goods and opened the way for trade.

**688. Missionaries and European Intervention.** In some instances injudicious missionaries doubtless showed too little appreciation of the ancient culture of India, China, and Japan, and rudely denounced the cherished traditions and the rooted prejudices of the peoples to whom they went. Even the most prudent and sagacious among them could hardly avoid arousing the hostility of those whose most revered institutions they felt it their duty to attack. So it came about that the missionaries were often badly treated, underwent great hardships, and were even murdered by infuriated mobs.

This generally led to the armed interference of their respective governments, and more than once, as we shall see, served these governments as an excuse for annexing the territory in which these outrages happened, or at least establishing protectorates.

### QUESTIONS

I. What great effects have resulted from modern improved means of communication? Give some examples. Describe the earliest attempts at steam navigation. Give a brief account of the construction of the two great interoceanic canals. Outline the history of railroad development in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Sketch the history of each of the following: the post; the telephone; the telegraph.

II. What is meant by imperialism? Describe the work of missionaries. What is the connection between the Industrial Revolution and imperialism?

### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) the steamboat and the railway, pp. 406-411; (2) the economics of modern imperialism, pp. 411-415; (3) the work of the missionaries, pp. 415-419.

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the old colonialism, pp. 547-550; (2) the new imperialism, pp. 550-560. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*; (3) the industrial revolution and imperialism, pp. 650-657.

## CHAPTER XXI

### THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

#### I. THE EXTENSION OF BRITISH DOMINION IN INDIA

**689. Task of extending the British Empire.** The story of the British struggle for colonial dominions and world markets—the rivalry with the Dutch, the wars for Spanish trade, the struggle with France in India and North America—we have brought down to the settlement at Vienna, which left England foremost among the commercial and colonial powers of all time. The task of continuing the extension of the British Empire in India, Africa, Canada, and Australasia was one of the important problems which occupied England's statesmen and her great merchants and manufacturers in the nineteenth century.

**690. British Dominion in India (1801).** Turning first to India, the British rule, in the opening years of the nineteenth century, extended over the Bengal region and far up the Ganges valley beyond Delhi. A narrow strip along the eastern coast, the southern point of the peninsula, and the island of Ceylon had also been brought under England's control, and in the west she held Bombay and a considerable area north of Surat.<sup>1</sup> In addition to these regions, which the English administered directly, there were a number of princes, such as the Nizam of Hyderabad, over whom they exercised the right of "protection." They had secured a foothold which made it evident that the Mogul emperor, who retained but the shadow of power at Delhi, could never recover the shattered dominions of the great Aurungzeb (§ 70). The French and Portuguese possessions had declined into mere trading posts along the coast, and in the heart of India only one power disputed the advance of the English toward the complete conquest of the peninsula.

<sup>1</sup> See maps, p. 36 and p. 436.

**691. The Mahratta Wars.** This power was a union of native princes known as the Mahratta Confederacy. The country occupied by this confederation extended inward from the Bombay coast and was bounded on the western border by mountain ranges. The ruling princes, however, who had formed the confederation,




FIG. 94. SCENE ON THE GANGES

Benares, the religious center of Hinduism, rises from the curving shore of the sacred Ganges River, its many domes and minarets giving it an appearance of great splendor. Along the river are many richly ornamented landing places built by pious devotees. The narrow streets behind are crowded with Brahmans and religious pilgrims

were, however, by no means peacefully disposed but were usually warring with one another, and where their territory bordered on British dominion the people were kept in constant danger and uncertainty by their restless and unsettled life. At length the English determined to suppress them altogether, and in a great war (1816-1818) they were finally conquered; a large part of their territories was annexed to the British possessions, and some of the princes were transformed into feudal lords under British sovereignty—a position which they retain to-day.



**692. British Expansion toward China.** While pacifying the interior of India the British were also occupied with the defense and extension of their frontiers on the north, east, and west. For six hundred miles along the northern frontier there was chronic disorder fomented by the Gurkhas—a race composed of a mixture of the hill men and the Hindu plain dwellers. Periodically the Gurkha chieftains would sweep down into the valley, loot the villages of the defenseless peasants, and then retire to their mountain retreats. The Gurkha leaders established themselves in Nepal. They then sought to extend their sway at the expense of the British in the Ganges valley, but were badly beaten in a two years' war (1814–1816) and compelled to cede to the British Empire a vast northern region, which brought the Anglo-Indian boundary at that point to the borders of Tibet, high up in the Himalaya Mountains.

**693. Annexation in Burma (1826–1885).** While the British were busy with the Mahrattas and Nepalese, the Burmese were pressing into the Bengal districts from the east. They had never met the disciplined Europeans in armed conflict and were confident that they would be able to expand westward indefinitely. Their ambitions were, however, checked by the British (1824–1826), and they were compelled to cede to the victors a considerable strip of territory along the east coast of the Bay of Bengal. Having thus made their first definite advance beyond the confines of India proper, the British, after twenty-five years of peace with the Burmese, engaged in a second war against them in 1852 and made themselves masters of the Irawadi valley and a long narrow strip of coast below Rangoon.<sup>1</sup>

**694. Conquest of the Sindh and Punjab Regions.** After the gains made at the expense of the Burmese the northwestern frontier next attracted the attention of the conquering British. In the valley of the Indus, where the soldiers of Alexander the Great had faltered on their eastward march (Vol. I, § 265), there was a fertile region known as the Sindh, ruled over by an Ameer, who seems to have shown an irritating independence in his dealings with the

<sup>1</sup> Additional annexations were made after another Burmese war in 1884–1885.

British. On the ground that the Ameer's government was inefficient and corrupt, the British invaded his territory in 1843, and after some brilliant campaigning they wrested his domain from him and added it to their Indian empire, thus winning a strong western frontier.

This enterprise was scarcely concluded when a war broke out with the Sikhs in the northwest, which resulted in the addition of the great Punjab region farther up the valley of the Indus, northeast of Sindh, and the extension of the boundary of the Anglo-Indian empire to the borders of Afghanistan.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to this policy of annexation through war with the natives, a process of "peaceful assimilation" was adopted under the governorship of Lord Dalhousie (1848-1856), who quietly transformed "protected" states into British provinces whenever the direct line of the ruling houses became extinct.

**695. Native Discontent in India.** It was inevitable that the conquest and annexation of so many native Indian states should stir up intense hatred against the British aggressors. The Mohammedans cherished a religious abhorrence for the Christian intruders in addition to their bitterness at the loss of their former power. The native Mahrattas had good reason to feel that only the advent of the British had prevented them from transforming the peninsula into a Mahratta empire.

**696. Introduction of Greased Cartridges.** There were embers of discontent everywhere, and they were fanned into a consuming flame in 1857 by several military reforms undertaken by the English government. The year before, the British had become impressed with the advantages of a new rifle invented by a

<sup>1</sup> The province of Baluchistan on the northwest has been brought under British dominion by gradual annexations beginning in 1876 and extending down to 1903. Several of the districts were formally organized as British Baluchistan in 1887. In attempting to extend their authority over the neighboring Afghanistan the British have waged two wars with the ruler of that country, one in 1837-1843 and the last in 1878-1880. The problem how to maintain control over Afghanistan and use it as a protecting state against Russia's southeasterly advance long constituted one of the fundamental issues of Anglo-Indian politics. Recently, however, Russia and England came to terms on the question of the boundaries and proceeded to divide up Persia, Russia taking the north and Britain the south, leaving only a strip of autonomous territory between. See map, p. 436.

Frenchman. It was loaded with a paper cartridge containing powder and ball, which was slipped into the barrel and then rammed down into place. In order to slide more easily into the gun the paper was greased, and the soldier had to tear off one end of it with his teeth so that the powder would take fire when the cap was exploded.

**697. The Sepoy Mutiny (1857).** The introduction of this new rifle seemed innocent enough, but the government had not taken into account certain religious scruples of the "sepoys," as the native troops were called. The Hindu regarded touching the fat of a cow as contamination worse than death, and to Mohammedans the fat of swine was almost as horrifying. The government soon heard of this grievance and promised not to use the objectionable grease. Peace was thus maintained for a time, but in May, 1857, some soldiers at Meerut, in the broad plain between the Jumna and the Ganges, refused to receive the cartridges served out to them and were thereupon sentenced to prison for ten years.

Their native companions rallied to their support and rose in rebellion; the next day, May 11, the soldiers mutinied at Delhi, massacred the English inhabitants of the city, and besieged the garrison; in a few days the entire Northwest was in full revolt. Lucknow, with its population of seven hundred thousand natives, rose against the British and besieged them in their fortifications. At Cawnpore, about forty miles to the south, a thousand British men, women, and children were cruelly massacred after they had surrendered, and by the middle of July all Oudh and the Northwest seemed lost.

**698. The Sepoy Rebellion Crushed.** Immediately after the insurrection at Meerut the governor-general telegraphed to Bombay, Madras, and Ceylon for instant help. Though there were as yet no railroads in the rebellious provinces, the telegraph helped to save the empire. Aid was at once sent to Lucknow, and in November the brave garrison, which had held out for nearly six months, was relieved. Many of the sepoys remained loyal, and with aid from the coast provinces city after city was wrested from

the mutineers. By the end of November British India was saved, but at a frightful cost. The English, surrounded by millions of natives and infuriated by the atrocities of the rebels, resorted to wholesale executions and imposed other terrible punishments.

**699. The British Government supplants the East India Company (1858).** After the suppression of the sepoy rebellion the Parliament of Great Britain revolutionized the government of India. The administration of the peninsula was finally taken entirely out of the hands of the East India Company, which had directed it for more than two hundred and fifty years, and vested in the British sovereign, to be exercised under parliamentary control.

Twenty years later (on January 1, 1877) Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India amid an illustrious gathering of Indian princes and British officials, and the pomp and magnificence of the ancient Moguls were revived to impress the people with the power of their British conquerors. George V, emperor of India, now rules over about three hundred millions of Indian subjects inhabiting a domain embracing 1,773,000 square miles.

**700. Progress in India since the Mutiny.** After the great mutiny the British government in India was concerned chiefly with problems of internal reform and with the defense of the frontiers, especially in the Northwest. The proportion of natives to white men in the army was greatly reduced and the artillery placed almost entirely in charge of the British. The construction of railway lines was pushed forward with great rapidity so that the vast interior might be quickly reached by troops and an outlet opened for its crops of cotton, rice, wheat, indigo, and tobacco. Cotton mills rose by the tombs of ancient kings, cities increased rapidly in population, and the foreign trade by sea multiplied twentyfold in seventy years. Over eight hundred newspapers—printed in twenty-two languages, including Burmese, Sanskrit, and Persian—were published; educational institutions were provided for nearly five million students.

**701. Beginnings of Self-government in India.** In short, an industrial and educational revolution took place in India, and the Indians began to be discontented with a government in which



they had little share. In response to this growth of national spirit the British Parliament, by three acts of 1915, 1916, and 1917, took steps in the direction of self-government for India. It created a general Indian legislature composed of two houses, each embracing a majority of members elected by popular vote. Legislative assemblies were also set up in the several provinces and more careers opened to natives in the conduct of their public affairs. All this, it was declared by Parliament, was done "with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the Empire" (see below, § 1100).

## II. THE DOMINION OF CANADA

**702. A Liberal Government for Canada (1774).** When the English government was established in Canada after the capture of Quebec and Montreal in 1760 (§ 72), only about two hundred of the sixty-five thousand inhabitants were of English origin; the rest were French. Barriers of race, language, laws, and religion separated the conquerors from the conquered. For a few years the English administration, not unnaturally, was badly adapted to the needs of its new subjects, but in 1774, on the eve of the war with the American colonies, the British Parliament, in order to insure the allegiance of the Canadians, passed the famous Quebec Act—one of the most remarkable enactments in the history of English law. In an age of intolerance it recognized the Catholic faith, allowed the clergy to collect their tithes, and left French laws, customs, and traditions undisturbed.

**703. American Loyalists in Canada.** Under this act the new colony stood patriotically by England during the American Revolution, and though France was herself allied with the revolting colonies, the Canadians repulsed their advances and received fugitive loyalists in great numbers. The latter, known as the United Empire Loyalists, settled in what are now the Maritime Provinces and also in Upper Canada—the region lying along the Great Lakes, which was to become the province of Ontario. It is estimated that by 1806 about eighty thousand loyalist




FIG. 95. THE IMPERIAL DURBAR, INDIA

In a great ceremonial gathering, or *darbar*, the princes of India meet to offer allegiance to the British ruler upon his accession. The last imperial *darbar* was a scene of great magnificence, as this procession of bejeweled princes and elephants shows. The actual ceremony was upon too vast a scale to be reproduced in a single picture



immigrants had crossed the frontier from the United States—the British government offering lands and subsidies to encourage their coming.

**704. Canada divided into Two Provinces.** The influx of an English population necessitated a change in the government, which had been designed especially for the French. Consequently, in 1791, representative government was established in Canada by a new act of Parliament. The country was divided into two provinces—an upper one, Ontario, lying mainly along the Great Lakes, which was being rapidly settled by the English, and a lower one, Quebec, which had long been the home of the French.

**705. Canada and the War of 1812.** When in 1812 the United States, angered by England's interference with American shipping (§§ 316–318), declared war on Great Britain, Henry Clay, then Speaker of the House, claimed that it would be an easy enterprise to conquer Canada. But both the old loyalists in Ontario, who had fled from the United States, and the French Canadians combined in support of the mother country. They undertook an expedition against the great republic to the south, but were soon repulsed with no important results except to prove their unfailing loyalty to Great Britain.

**706. Rebellion and Self-government.** Amicably as the Canadians in the two provinces coöperated against the United States, they were troubled by domestic dissensions. In Upper Canada (now Ontario) United Empire Loyalists were in control of the government. They were mostly Tories in their political sympathies. The Liberals became exasperated at the lack of responsible government, and a section of them took up arms in 1837. In Lower Canada (now Quebec) rebellion broke out as well, due to irritation of the French at British rule. Both rebellions were easily crushed, but the British sent over an investigator, Lord Durham, whose report (1840),—the "Magna Carta of the Colonies,"—advocating self-government for the colonies, marks a turning point in the attitude of England toward the treatment of her possessions beyond the seas. From that time on it has been a matter of principle in British politics to give self-government to



her colonies so far as it can be done. This is one of the most important revolutions in the history of government. The British self-governing colonies even make their own treaties and are practically free nations. The report was followed by the Act of Union, bringing the two provinces under one government, which was responsible to the people.

**707. The Federation of 1867.** This was an important step in the direction of the Canadian federation, which was organized a




FIG. 96. THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, OTTAWA

Parliament Hill is beautifully situated beside the Ottawa River. The main building was burned, February, 1916

few years later. By the British North America Act of 1867 Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia were united into the Dominion of Canada, with the provision that the remaining provinces and territories might be admitted later. This federation was given a constitution providing for a governor-general representing the sovereign of England; a Senate, the members of which are appointed for life by the governor-general; and a House of Commons, which is the real governing body, elected by popular vote. The new plan of federation went into effect on July 1, 1867—a day which is celebrated as the Canadian national holiday, like the Fourth of July in the United States.

**708. Expansion of the Canadian Federation.** After the formation of the federation the history of the Dominion was characterized by rapid business development and the growth of a national spirit among the Canadian people. The great western regions were divided into territories and then into provinces, just as the western part of the United States was organized first into territories and then into states. In 1869 the extensive rights which the Hudson Bay Company possessed for more than two hundred years over vast regions encircling Hudson Bay were purchased. The province of Manitoba was laid out in 1870; in 1871 British Columbia, which had been occupied after the settlement of the Oregon controversy with the United States, was admitted to the federation; Prince Edward Island followed two years later; and in 1905 the great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan came into the union, leaving only Newfoundland outside. The tide of immigration rose slowly, and the population, which was a little over half a million in 1820, was more than five millions at the close of the century, and is now over nine millions.

**709. Growth of National Spirit in Canada.** The development of Canadian industries under the encouragement of protective tariffs and government bounties encouraged the feeling that Canada constitutes a nation by herself, in spite of her position as a member of the British Empire. The trading relations between Canada and the United States were hampered by the protective policy which the government at Washington followed after the close of the Civil War. As a result, Canada was driven to look more and more to Great Britain as her industrial ally rather than to the neighboring republic. The rejection by Canada, in 1911, of a plan for trade reciprocity with the United States showed that there was little support for anything that had the faintest resemblance to annexation to the republic. In the election of that year the Conservative party, which stood for closer ties with the mother country and a protective tariff against the United States, was returned to power with a very large majority.

## III. THE AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES

**710. Special Features of Australasia.** The Australasian colonies of Great Britain—Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and some of the minor islands—were practically unoccupied when the English colonists began to flock there in the nineteenth century. The natives of Australia and Tasmania were never very numerous or warlike. The English were therefore free, in these vast regions, to work out in their own way a democratic government suited to the conditions in which they found themselves.

The continent of Australia, with the neighboring island of Tasmania, slightly exceeds in extent the area of the United States, while New Zealand alone is somewhat larger than the island of Great Britain. Although a great part of Australia lies in the temperate zone, the northern region nearest the equator is parched in summer, and the whole central portion suffers from a scarcity of water, which makes vast areas of the interior permanently uninhabitable unless some means of irrigation on a large scale can be introduced. The eastern and southern coasts have always been the chief centers of colonization. Melbourne, in the extreme south, lies in a latitude corresponding to that of Washington, St. Louis, and San Francisco in the northern hemisphere. The country affords gold, silver, coal, tin, copper, and iron. Tasmania and New Zealand are more fortunate than Australia in the diversity of their scenery and the general fertility of their soil, while their climate is said to possess all the advantages of the mother country without her fog and smoke.

**711. Early Explorations.** The English occupation of Australasia belongs to the nineteenth century. The Portuguese, in their eager hunt for the Spice Islands, may perhaps have come upon Australia, but it long remained an unknown portion of the globe; as shown by the rude outline of *Terra Australis* (or Southern Land) which appears on the maps of the Elizabethan age. In 1642 a Dutch seaman, Tasman, discovered the island which now bears his name (originally called Van Dieman's Land). He also sighted in the same year the islands to the east, which, in spite



of their almost Alpine character, were named New Zealand, after the low-lying meadows at the mouth of the Rhine.

**712. Captain Cook's Voyages.** The Dutch did not, however, occupy these lands, which were later brought to the attention of the English by the famous voyages of Captain Cook. He skirted around the entire coast of New Zealand in 1769–1770 and then sailed westward to Australia, reaching land at a point which, owing to its luxuriant foliage, he called Botany Bay. He took possession of the continent in the name of the English sovereign, and it was called New South Wales, on account of its fancied resemblance to the Welsh shore line.

**713. Founding the Australian Colonies.** In 1787 England began the colonization of Australia by transporting to Botany Bay a number of convicts. Just north of Botany Bay lies an excellent harbor, and the town of Sydney, which grew up on its shores, became the chief city of New South Wales, the first of six sister states, which now form the Australian federation. The English settlements in Tasmania—with the town of Hobart, established in 1804—and in Western Australia also began as convict stations. Some settlements which had grown up around the town of Melbourne were united in 1851 to form the colony of Victoria. Shortly after, the region to the north of Sydney was organized into the colony of Queensland. South Australia, with its town of Adelaide, sprang up as an independent settlement of free men, never having had the misfortune of being used as a station for criminals.

The discovery of gold in Australia in 1851 brought in many settlers, and as the colonies advanced in wealth and prosperity protest was made against the transportation of criminals, and the British government finally abandoned it. Civil government supplanted the military rule which had been exercised over the convict stations, and each colony at length secured self-government; that is, a parliament and a ministry of its own, under the general sovereignty of the British crown.


**714. The Formation of the Australian Commonwealth.** It was natural that in time the people of these colonies, speaking the same language and having the same institutions, should seek



a closer union. The question of a federation was long discussed, and at last, in 1891, a general convention composed of delegates from all the states drafted a federal constitution, which was submitted to the people for their ratification. In 1900 the British Parliament passed an act founding the Commonwealth of Australia on the basis of this draft. The six states—New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia—are now formed into a union similar to that of the United States. The king is represented by a governor-general; the federal parliament is composed of two houses—a Senate, consisting of six senators from each state, and a House of Representatives, chosen in the same way as in the United States. This body has extensive power over commerce, railways, currency, banking, postal and telegraph service, marriage and divorce, and industrial arbitration.

**715. The Settlement of New Zealand.** To the southeast of Australia, twelve hundred miles away, lie the islands of New Zealand, to which English pioneers began to go in the early part of the nineteenth century. In 1840 the English concluded a treaty with the native Maoris, by which the latter were assigned a definite reservation of lands on condition that they would recognize Queen Victoria as their sovereign. The English settlers established the city of Auckland on North Island, and twenty-five years later New Zealand became a separate colony, with the seat of government at Wellington. Under the auspices of the New Zealand Company colonization was actively carried on, and before long the whites began to press in upon the reservations of the Maoris. This led to two revolts on the part of the natives (1860 and 1871), which were, however, speedily repressed and have not been repeated.


**716. Social Reform in Australasia.** New Zealand during the closing decade of the nineteenth century became famous for its experiments in social reform. Organized labor rose to great power in politics and carried through a number of measures conceived in the interest of workingmen. Special courts were established to settle disputes between employers and their workmen; a pension






180 160 140 120 100 Longitude 80 West 60 from 40 Greenwicl

0 20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180



# THE BRITISH EMPIRE, 1914

British Possessions are colored  
in Pink



ANTARCTIC OCEAN

0 20 Longitude 40 East 60 from 80 Greenwich 100 120 140 160 180





law helped the poor in their old age. Various measures were adopted for discouraging the creation of large estates by taxing them more heavily than small farms. The right to vote was enjoyed by women as well as by men.<sup>1</sup>

The colony of Victoria vied with New Zealand in respect to social reform. The government attempted to stop "sweating" in the poorly paid industries, and public boards composed of employers and workmen were established for the purpose of fixing the minimum wages and standards of work, so that these matters were no longer arranged by private bargaining between individuals. The system of secret voting which originated in Australia—the so-called "Australian ballot"—is a reform which has already spread beyond Australasia and is in use both in England and in the United States.

#### IV. GROWTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN AFRICA

**717. The Dutch in South Africa.** The chief centers of British advance in Africa have been two—the Cape of Good Hope at the extreme south and Egypt<sup>2</sup> in the north. The Cape Colony was permanently acquired, as we have seen, at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 (§ 360), some eight years after its actual seizure from the Dutch during the war with Napoleon. When this colony passed into the hands of the British it contained slightly over twenty-five thousand people of European descent, mainly Dutch, and it is from this original Dutch stock that the majority of the present white inhabitants are derived, although immigration from England set in after the fall of Napoleon. These Dutch settlers were a sturdy, resolute people, strongly attached to their customs, including slavery, and though of peaceable spirit, they were unwilling to submit to interference. It was just these characteristics which the new rulers overlooked. Shortly after their occupation the British reconstructed the system of local government and the

<sup>1</sup> In Australia also women were permitted to vote for members of the federal parliament and in the local elections of all the states.

<sup>2</sup> The circumstances which led England to interfere in Egyptian affairs will be considered below, §§ 830-833.

courts; they insisted on the use of the English language; and finally, in 1833, they abolished slavery.

**718. Migrations of the Boers.** Owing to these grievances about ten thousand of the Boers<sup>1</sup> left the Cape during the years 1836 to 1838 and pressing northeastward beyond the Orange River into the interior, partly inhabited by warlike savages, set up a new colony. During the succeeding years large numbers of the Boers pushed farther eastward and northward into the regions now known as Natal and the Transvaal. For a time they had their own way in these barren wildernesses.

**719. British Advance in South Africa.** Natal, however, was on the seacoast, and the British had no desire to see a strong unfriendly state established there. Consequently they sent troops over to occupy Durban (then called Port Natal), which had formerly been the seat of some English settlers. These troops came into conflict with the Dutch there in 1842 and drove them out, adding more bitterness to the ill will which the Boers already felt for the English. The conquerors cared little, however, for Dutch opinion, and six years later (in 1848) they seized the Orange River Colony, which the Boers had founded between the Orange and Vaal rivers.

**720. The Transvaal and Orange Free State.** Once more a great Boer migration began, this time into the region beyond the Vaal, where pioneers had already broken the way. There the Transvaal Colony was founded. The British believed that the vast inland wilderness was good only for cattle raising and rude agriculture and was therefore not worth the trouble of annexation and defense. Accordingly, in 1852, by a treaty known as the Sand River Convention, they recognized the independence of the Boers in the Transvaal region, guaranteeing them the right "to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves according to their own laws, without any interference on the part of the British government." This was followed, two years later, by the recognition of the independence of the Orange River Colony under

<sup>1</sup> This is the Dutch word for "farmer" and has come to be especially applied to the Dutch population of South Africa.

the name of the Orange Free State, which retained its independence until the Boer war of 1899 brought it again under British sovereignty.

**721. British Suzerainty over the Transvaal.** In the Transvaal the Dutch lived a rude, wild life, having little government and desiring little. They were constantly embroiled with the natives, and as time went on the British began to complain, as they had previously of the Orange River Colony, that these disorders constituted a standing menace to the peace of the neighboring colonies. Whether or not there was any justification for this claim, Great Britain in 1877 annexed the Transvaal Republic, whose independence it had recognized twenty-five years before. The government thus imposed upon the Boers was extremely galling, and in 1880 they organized an insurrection and destroyed a small detachment of English troops at Majuba Hill (1881).

**722. Policy of Gladstone.** At that time Gladstone was in office, and turning a deaf ear to the demands of the imperialists for vengeance, he determined to grant to the Dutch that independence for which they had fought. The Boers succeeded in 1884 in obtaining an agreement on the part of Great Britain recognizing the Transvaal as free and independent in all respects except the conclusion of treaties with foreign powers. They thus regained, for all practical purposes, the freedom which they had enjoyed before the annexation of 1877.

**723. The Discovery of Gold in the Transvaal.** The very next year (1885) gold was discovered in the southern part of the Transvaal, and wild lands which the negroes had despised and from which the patient Boers could scarcely wring a scanty living now became exceedingly valuable. Thousands of miners, prospectors, speculators, and the customary rabble of the mining camp began to flow into the Transvaal, and within a short time the population had trebled. The Boers were now outnumbered by the newcomers—the *Uitlanders*, or foreigners, as they were called. The Dutch, in order to retain their supremacy, put all sorts of obstacles in the way of the newcomers who wished to acquire citizenship and the right to vote.



**724. Quarrels between the British and Dutch.** It was now the turn of the Uitlanders (who were largely English) to protest. They declared that their energy and enterprise had transformed a poor and sparsely settled country into a relatively populous and prosperous one; that they had enriched the treasury of the almost bankrupt Boer government; and that since they also had a stake in the country, they should be allowed a voice in making the laws and in the administration of justice. They tried to effect a change in the Transvaal constitution, and, failing that, they planned in 1895 an insurrection against the Boer authorities.

**725. The Jameson Raid (1895).** The conspiracy was encouraged by Cecil Rhodes, prime minister of Cape Colony and head of the British South Africa Company. It is alleged that he was supported in this by some of those who were then in control of the home government. Dr. Jameson, an agent of the company, who was much interested in promoting some of Rhodes's great schemes started for the interior of the Transvaal at the head of an armed band of the company's forces with the intention of coöperating with those who were preparing for an uprising at Johannesburg. The enterprise miscarried, however, and the insurgents were captured by the Boers.

**726. Attitude of President Kruger.** This "Jameson raid," as it is called, only served further to embitter the Boers and afforded them a pretext for collecting large military supplies in self-defense. The president of the Transvaal Republic, Paul Kruger, was firmly opposed to all compromise with the British. He was practically master of the little oligarchy that controlled the republic; he persistently disregarded the petitions of the Uitlanders and entered into an offensive and defensive alliance with the Orange Free State to the south.

**727. The Boer War (1899).** The English now began to claim that the Boers would not be satisfied until they had got control of all the British possessions in South Africa. The Boers, with more reason as it seemed to the rest of the world, declared that England was only trying to find an excuse for annexing the two republics which the Dutch farmers had built up in the wilderness

after a long fight with the native savages. Finally, in 1899, the weak Transvaal and the Orange Free State boldly declared war on England. The Boers made a brave fight, and the English managed the war badly. Many Englishmen thought it a shame to be fighting Paul Kruger and his fellow farmers, but although the greater number of foreign nations were in sympathy with the Boers, no one of the powers intervened. Finally, England, after some humiliating defeats, was victorious and annexed the two Boer republics.

**728. Formation of the South African Union.** With a wise liberality toward the conquered Boers, Britain proceeded to give them self-government like other parts of the empire. In 1910 an act of Parliament formed a South African Union on the model of Canada and Australia. This includes the flourishing Cape Colony, with its great diamond mines about Kimberley, Natal to the northeast, and the two Boer republics—the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. These are now managed as a single federation by a representative of the British ruler and a parliament which makes laws for the whole union.

**729. The Attitude of the Boers in the World War.** When war broke out between England and Germany in 1914 the Germans expected all the Boers to rise against England, but they were disappointed. There was only a small revolt, which was easily suppressed. The prime minister of the South African Union, General Botha, who had been the best Boer general in the war against England fifteen years before, not only stamped out the



FIG. 97. GENERAL LOUIS BOTHA

uprising of his old comrades but conquered German Southwest Africa for the British Empire. In addition, South African



FIG. 98. BRIDGE ACROSS THE ZAMBEZI RIVER, NEAR VICTORIA FALLS

Built in 1905 on the "Cape to Cairo" railway, this bridge crosses the great canyon in which for forty miles the river runs below the falls. The falls are twice the height of Niagara and over a mile wide. They occur about midway in the two-thousand-mile course of the river

1898 and, with subsequent additions, brought under the protection of the British government. On the east coast, extending inland to the great lakes at the source of the Nile, lies the valuable

troops invaded German East Africa and fought on the main battle line in France. General Smuts, another Boer commander, was prominent in the peace conference and showed much wisdom in his recommendations. The British look with much natural pride upon this tribute to their wisdom in granting freedom and self-government to the Boers.<sup>1</sup>

**730. Other British Possessions in Africa.** In addition to these colonies, Great Britain has three enormous provinces in Africa occupied almost entirely by negroes. North of the Cape lies the Bechuanaland protectorate, inhabited by peaceful native tribes. Beyond Bechuanaland and the Transvaal is Rhodesia, which was acquired through the British South Africa Company by two annexations in 1888 and

<sup>1</sup> There are about six millions of people in the South African Union, but a large portion of these are colored. The white population, including both those of English and those of Dutch descent, do not equal in number the inhabitants of Philadelphia.



ranching land of British East Africa. It is of especial value as controlling the southern approach to the Sudan and Egypt, which are so important to Britain.

In addition to these colonies in Africa, British Somaliland was secured on the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb in 1884 in connection with the establishment of the English power in Egypt. Along the west coast Great Britain has five centers, Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, Lagos, and Nigeria—the beginnings of which date back to the times of Queen Elizabeth, when the British were ravaging the coast for slaves to carry to the New World. The English now, however, are making atonement for the past by helping the natives to become civilized, sending physicians to fight tropical diseases, and governing well.

Several railways have been built in South Africa, one running through the whole country from Cape Town to the northern border of Rhodesia. There was once much talk of an "all British line from the Cape to Cairo" across Africa, but the extension of the Belgian Congo Free State on the northwest, and especially of German East Africa on the northeast, blocked this plan. The hope was revived, however, by the victory over the Germans during the World War.



FIG. 99. GENERAL JAN CHRISTIAN SMUTS

General Smuts became premier of the union of South Africa and used his influence against a movement to break away from Great Britain in 1921. He showed himself deeply concerned for the success of the League of Nations and expressed a high esteem for the rôle played by President Wilson in promoting its organization. (From a drawing by Francis Dodd. Used by permission)



At the close of the conflict German East Africa was handed over to great Britain under the so-called "mandatory system," and German Southwest Africa was transferred to the Union of South Africa (§ 1028 below).

### TABLE OF PRINCIPAL BRITISH POSSESSIONS

IN EUROPE: Great Britain and Ireland, Gibraltar, and Malta.

IN ASIA: Aden, Perim, Sokotra, Kuria Muria Islands, Bahrein Islands, British Borneo, Ceylon, Cyprus, Hongkong, India and dependencies, Labuan, the Straits Settlements, the Federated Malay States, Weihaiwei.

IN AFRICA: Ascension Island, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, British East Africa, Cape of Good Hope, mandatory of German East Africa, German Southwest Africa, Nyasaland Protectorate, Zanzibar, Mauritius, Natal, Orange River Colony, Rhodesia, St. Helena, Tristan da Cunha, Seychelles, Somaliland, Transvaal Colony, Swaziland, Northern Nigeria, Southern Nigeria, the Gold Coast, Gambia, Sierra Leone.

IN NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA: Bermudas, Canada, Falkland Islands, British Guiana, British Honduras, Newfoundland and Labrador, the West Indies, including Bahama Islands, Barbados, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad, and Windward Islands.

IN AUSTRALIA AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS: The Commonwealth of Australia (including New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania), New Zealand, New Guinea (British), Fiji Islands, Tonga or Friendly Islands, and other minor islands in the Pacific.

Total area, 11,447,954 square miles. Population, 419,401,371.

### QUESTIONS

I. Describe the position of the British in India at the opening of the nineteenth century. Show on a map the extension of British control over India in that century. Mention the causes of discontent in India prior to the Indian mutiny. What was the immediate cause of the mutiny of 1857? What change in government resulted from this uprising? Show the progress which has been made in India since 1857.

II. Outline the history of the British in Canada from 1760 to 1812. What was the cause of the Canadian rebellion of 1837? Describe the federation of the Canadian provinces in 1867. Draw a map of Canada, showing the additions to the federation down to the year 1905.

III. Give a short account of Australian exploration and colonization. Describe the Australian Commonwealth. Give an account of social reform in New Zealand and Victoria.

IV. How did the British gain possession of the Cape of Good Hope? Describe the relations between the Boers and the British down to 1848, and from that date to 1881. What was the result of Gladstone's South African policy? Show the effect of the discovery of gold upon the relations of the British and the Dutch in South Africa from 1885 to 1899.

Give a brief account of the Boer War. What colonies make up the South African Union? Describe the form of government of the South African Union. Draw a map showing the British possessions in South Africa before the World War.

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) British dominion in India, pp. 306-316; (2) the Dominion of Canada, pp. 316-322; (3) the Australasian colonies, pp. 322-327; (4) the conflict between the English and the Boers in South Africa, pp. 327-336.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: India (History of), East India Company, Sepoy Mutiny, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Paul Kruger, and Egypt.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the self-governing British colonies, pp. 641-657; (2) the crown colonies, pp. 657-662; (3) the Indian Empire, pp. 662-672. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) India and Egypt, pp. 400-407; (5) Canada and Australia, pp. 407-412; (6) South Africa, pp. 413-417; (7) imperial federation, pp. 418-423.

## CHAPTER XXII

### THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

#### I. THE REIGNS OF ALEXANDER I (1801-1825) AND NICHOLAS I (1825-1855)

**731. Growing Importance of Russia in World History.** During the nineteenth century Russia came steadily into ever closer relations with western Europe. Although still a backward country in many respects, she was busily engaged in modernizing herself. The works of some of her writers are widely read in foreign lands, especially those of Leo Tolstoy. The music of Rubinstein and Tschaikowsky is as highly esteemed in London or New York as in Leningrad or Moscow. Even in the field of science such names as that of Mendeléeff, the chemist, and of Metchnikoff, the biologist, are well known to their fellow workers in Germany, France, England, and America. In 1917 the great social revolution in Russia roused the keen interest of the whole world. It becomes, therefore, a matter of vital interest to follow the changes which are turning the tide of modern civilization into eastern Europe.

**732. Russia under Alexander I.** When, in 1815, Tsar Alexander I returned to St. Petersburg after the close of the Congress of Vienna, he could view his position and recent achievements with pride. He had participated in Napoleon's overthrow, and had succeeded in uniting the rulers of western Europe in that Holy Alliance (§ 367) which he had so much at heart. But his chief interests lay, of course, in his own vast empire. He was the undisputed and autocratic ruler of more than half of the entire continent of Europe, not to speak of the almost interminable reaches of northern Asia which lay beneath his scepter.

**733. Heterogeneous Peoples under Russian Rule.** Under Alexander's dominion there were many races and peoples, differing in






WESTERN PORTION OF THE  
RUSSIAN EMPIRE  
BEFORE THE REVOLUTION OF 1917

Boundary of the Russian Empire





NOTE: Finland, the Baltic Provinces, Poland and Caucasus are all, except Finland, integral portions of the Russian Empire; they have nevertheless been assigned a special color in the map on account of certain peculiarities in the relation of each to the Russian government.

0 100 200 300 400 500  
Scale of Miles

from Greenwich



customs, language, and religion—Finns, Germans, Poles, Jews, Tartars, Armenians, Georgians, and Mongols.<sup>1</sup> The Russians themselves, it is true, had colonized the southern plains of European Russia and had spread even into Siberia. They made up a large proportion of the population of the empire, and their language was everywhere taught in the schools and used by the officials. The people of the grand duchy of Finland, speaking Swedish and Finnish, did not like their incorporation with Russia; and the Poles, recalling the time when their kingdom far outshone the petty duchy of Moscow among the European powers, still hoped that the kingdom of Poland might form an independent nation with its own language and constitution.

In the time of Alexander I the Russians had not begun to flock to the cities, which were small and ill-constructed compared with those of western Europe. The great mass of the population still lived in the country, and more than half of them were serfs, as ignorant and wretched as those of France or England in the twelfth century.

**734. Absolutism and Liberal Ideas.** Alexander I had inherited, as "Autocrat of all the Russias," a despotic power over his subjects as absolute as that to which Louis XIV laid claim. He could make war and conclude peace at will, freely appoint or dismiss his ministers, and order the arrest, imprisonment, exile, or execution of anyone he chose, without consulting or giving an account to any living being. Even the Russian national Church was under his personal control.

During his early years Alexander entertained liberal ideas, but after his return from the Congress of Vienna he began to dismiss his liberal advisers. He became as apprehensive of revolution as his friend Metternich, and threw himself into the arms of the "Old Russian" party, which obstinately opposed the introduction of all Western ideas. The Tsar was soon denouncing liberalism as

<sup>1</sup> The Cossacks, or light cavalry, who constituted so conspicuous a feature of the Russian army, were originally lawless rovers on the southern and eastern frontiers, composed mainly of adventurous Russians with some admixture of other peoples. Certain districts were assigned to them by the government — on the lower Don, near the Black Sea, the Urals, and elsewhere — in return for military service.



a frightful illusion which threatened the whole social order. He permitted his officials to do all they could to stamp out the ideas which he had himself formerly done so much to encourage. The censorship of the press put an end to the liberal periodicals which had sprung up, and professors in the universities were dismissed




FIG. 100. THE KREMLIN, MOSCOW

The Kremlin is a walled inclosure occupying a hill of about one hundred acres in the heart of Moscow. Five gates surmounted with towers open into its picturesque courts, where some three cathedrals, a convent and a monastery, a palace of the Tsars, and various other remarkable buildings are found, in which are priceless treasures of art as well as sacred relics venerated through all Russia. Note the peculiar architecture of the churches, due largely to oriental and Byzantine influence

for teaching modern science. The attraction of the new ideas was, however, so strong that the Tsar could not prevent some of his more enlightened subjects from following eagerly the course of the revolutionary movements in western Europe and reading the new books dealing with scientific discoveries and questions of political and social reform.

**735. Nicholas I and the Revolt of Poland (1830-1831).** Alexander I died suddenly on December 1, 1825. The revolutionary

societies seized this opportunity to organize a revolt known as the "Decembrist conspiracy." But the movement was badly organized; a few charges of grapeshot brought the insurgents to terms, and some of the leaders were hanged.

Nicholas I, Alexander's successor, never forgot the rebellion which inaugurated his reign, and he proved one of the most despotic of all the long list of autocratic rulers. His arbitrary measures speedily produced a revolt in Poland. The constitution which Alexander I had in his liberal days granted to the kingdom was violated. Russian troops were stationed there in great numbers, Russian officials forced their way into the government offices, and the petitions of the Polish diet were contemptuously ignored by the Tsar. Secret societies then began to promote a movement for the reëstablishment of the ancient Polish republic, which Catherine II and her fellow monarchs had destroyed (§§ 56-60). Late in 1830 an uprising occurred in Warsaw; the insurgents secured control of the city, drove out the Russian officials, organized a provisional government, and, appealing to the European powers for aid, proclaimed the independence of Poland, January 25, 1831.

Europe, however, made no response to Poland's appeal for assistance. The Tsar's armies were soon able to crush the rebellion, and when Poland lay prostrate at his feet, Nicholas gave no quarter. He revoked the constitution, abolished the diet, suppressed the national flag, and transferred forty-five thousand Polish families to the valley of the Don and the mountains of the Caucasus. To all intents and purposes Poland became henceforth merely a Russian province, governed, like the rest of the empire, from St. Petersburg.<sup>1</sup>

**736. The Autocracy of Nicholas I.** Nicholas I sincerely believed that Russia could only be saved from the "decay" of religion and government, which he believed to be taking place in western Europe, by maintaining autocracy, for this alone was strong enough to make head against the destructive ideas which some of his subjects in their blindness mistook for enlightenment.

<sup>1</sup> Thirty years later, in 1863, the Poles made another desperate attempt to free themselves from the yoke of Russia, but without success.

The Russian-Greek Church<sup>1</sup> and all its beliefs must be defended, and the Russian nation preserved as a separate and superior people who should maintain forever the noble beliefs and institutions of the past.<sup>2</sup> Certainly a great many of his advisers were well content with the system, and his army of officials were loath to recommend reform.

**737. Efforts of Nicholas I to check Liberalism.** Accordingly, in the name of Russian nationality, the Tsar adopted strong measures to check the growth of liberalism. The officials bestirred themselves to prevent in every way the admission into Russia of Western ideas. Books on religion and science were carefully examined by the police or the clergy; foreign works containing references to politics were confiscated or the objectionable pages were blotted out by the censors. The government officials did not hesitate freely to open private letters committed to the post. It may be said that, except for a few short intervals of freedom, this whole system was continued down to the World War.

## II. THE FREEING OF THE SERFS AND THE GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF REVOLUTION

**738. Alexander II and the Crimean War.** In 1854 the efforts of Russia to increase her influence in Turkey led to a war with France and England. The Russians were defeated, and their strong fortress of Sevastopol, in the Crimea, was captured by the

<sup>1</sup> The Russians were converted to Christianity by missionaries from Constantinople, the religious capital of the Eastern, or Greek, Church, which had gradually drifted away from the Latin, or Roman Catholic, Church in the seventh and eighth centuries. For many centuries the Russian Church remained in close relations with the patriarch of Constantinople, but after that city fell into the hands of the infidel Turks it occurred to the Russian rulers that the Tsars must be the divinely appointed successors of the Eastern emperors. Old Rome, on the Tiber, and new Rome, on the Bosphorus, had both fallen on account of their sins. Russia thus became the "third Rome," and the Tsar the head of all true Christians who accepted the only orthodox faith, that of the Greek Church. Under Peter the Great the Russian Church was brought completely under the control of the government.

<sup>2</sup> Nicholas introduced into the schools a catechism which recalls that of Napoleon I: "*Question.* What does religion teach us as to our duties to the Tsar? *Answer.* Worship, fidelity, the payment of taxes, service, love, and prayer—the whole being comprised in the words worship and fidelity."



allies.<sup>1</sup> Nicholas I died in the midst of the reverses of the Crimean War, leaving to his son, Alexander II, the responsibility of coming to terms with the enemy, and then, if possible, strengthening Russia by reducing the disgraceful political corruption and bribery which had been revealed by the war and by improving the lot of the people at large who lived in poverty and degradation.

**739. Situation of the Russian Serfs.** Nearly one half of the Tsar's subjects were serfs, whose bondage and wretched lives seemed to present an insurmountable barrier to general progress and prosperity. The landlord commonly reserved a portion of his estate for himself and turned over to his serfs barely enough to enable them to keep body and soul together. They usually spent three days in the week cultivating their lord's fields. He was their judge as well as their master

and could flog them at will. The Russian serfs were indeed practically slaves and were viewed as scarcely more than beasts of burden.

From time to time the serfs, infuriated by the hard conditions imposed upon them, revolted against their lords. During the reign of Catherine the Great a general uprising had taken place which grew to the proportions of a civil war and was only put down with terrible bloodshed and cruelty. Under Nicholas I over five hundred riots had occurred, and these seemed to increase rather than decrease, notwithstanding the vigilance of the police and the severity of the government.



FIG. 101. ALEXANDER II

<sup>1</sup> See next chapter.



**740. Emancipation of the Serfs (March, 1861).** Alexander II, fearful lest the peasants should again attempt to win their liberty by force, decided that the government must undertake the difficult task of freeing forty millions of his subjects from serfdom. After much discussion he issued an emancipation proclamation, March 3, 1861, on the eve of the great civil war which was to put an end to negro slavery in the United States.

In his anxiety to prevent any loss to the landowners, who constituted the ruling class in the Russian government, the Tsar did his work in a very half-hearted manner. It is true the government deprived the former lord of his right to force the peasants to work for him and pay him the old dues; he could no longer flog them or command them to marry against their will; but the peasants still remained bound to the land, for they were not permitted to leave their villages without a government pass. The landlords surrendered a portion of their estates to the peasants, but this did not become the property of *individual* owners, but of the *village community* as a whole. The land assigned to each village was to be redistributed periodically among the various families of the community so that, aside from his hut and garden, no peasant could lay claim permanently to any particular plot of land.

**741. The Landlords generously Treated.** The government dealt very generously with the landlords. It not only agreed that the peasants should be required to pay for such land as their former masters turned over to them, but commonly fixed the price at an amount far greater than the real value of the land—a price which the government paid and proposed to collect from the serfs in installments. His new freedom seemed to the peasant little better than that of a convict condemned to hard labor in the penitentiary. Indeed, he sometimes refused to be “freed” when he learned of the hard bargain which the government proposed to drive with him. There were hundreds of riots while the readjustments were taking place, which were sternly suppressed by the government. The peasants were compelled by force of arms to accept their “liberty” and pay the land tax which emancipation imposed upon them.



CHURCH OF ST. BASIL, MOSCOW

Built by Ivan the Terrible in 1554-1557. The architecture shows the effect of Byzantine art



742. Sad Lot of the "Freed" Serfs. Naturally, if the people in a given community increased, the size of the individual allotments inevitably decreased, and with that the chances of earning a livelihood. More than fifty years after the "freeing" of the serfs the peasant had, on the average, scarcely half as much land




FIG. 102. RUSSIAN PEASANT'S HOME

as that originally assigned to him. Although he lived constantly on the verge of starvation, he fell far behind in the payment of his taxes, so that in 1904 the Tsar, in a moment of forced generosity, canceled the arrears, which the peasants could, in any case, never have paid. A little later the Tsar issued an order permitting the peasants to leave their particular village and seek employment elsewhere. They might, on the other hand, become *owners* of their allotments. This led to the practical abolition of the ancient *mir*, or village community, and left millions of peasants as tenants of great landlords and sometimes as owners of their holdings.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These village communities had long existed in Russia, since the lords had usually found it convenient to have the village redistribute the land from time to time among the serfs as the number of inhabitants changed.



**743. The Rise of Nihilism.** Alexander II's despotic régime developed among the more cultivated classes a spirit of opposition, known as *nihilism*.<sup>1</sup> This was not in its origin a frantic terrorism, as commonly supposed, but an intellectual and moral revolt against tyranny in the State, bigotry in the Church, and all unreasonable traditions and unfounded prejudices. In short, the nihilist would have agreed with Voltaire, Diderot, and the Encyclopedists in exalting reason as man's sole guide in this mysterious world.

**744. Origin of Terrorism.** The government officials regarded the reformers with the utmost suspicion and began to arrest the more active among them. The prisons were soon crowded and hundreds were banished to Siberia. The Tsar and his police seemed to be the avowed enemies of all progress, and anyone who advanced a new idea was punished as if he had committed a murder. The peaceful preparation of the people for representative government could not go on so long as the police were arresting men for forming debating clubs. It seemed to the more ardent reformers that there was no course open to them but to declare war on the government as a body of cruel, corrupt tyrants who would keep Russia in darkness forever. They argued that the atrocious acts of the officials must be exposed, the government intimidated, and the eyes of the world opened to the horrors of the situation by startling acts of violence. So some of the reformers became *terrorists*, not because they were depraved men or loved bloodshed, but because they were convinced that there was no other way to save their beloved land from the fearful oppression under which it groaned.

**745. Oppression and Assassination.** The government fought terrorism with terrorism. In 1879 sixteen suspected revolutionists were hanged and scores sent to the dungeons of St. Petersburg or the mines of Siberia. The terrorists, on their part, retaliated by attacks on the Tsar and his government. A student tried to kill the Tsar as the head and representative of the whole tyrannical system. Attempts were made to blow up a special train on which

<sup>1</sup> The term "nihilist" was first introduced in Russia by Turgenev in his novel *Fathers and Children*. It was applied to the chief character on account of his denial of the authority of all tradition.

the Tsar was traveling, and, in another effort to kill him, the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg was wrecked by a revolutionist disguised as a carpenter.

In short, the efforts of the Tsar's officials to check the revolutionists proved vain, and the minister to whom the Tsar had given almost dictatorial powers to suppress the agitation finally saw that the government must make some concessions in order to pacify its enemies; so he advised Alexander II to grant a species of constitution, in which he should agree to convoke an assembly elected by the people and thereafter ask its opinion and counsel before making new and important laws. The Tsar finally consented, but it was too late. On the afternoon that he gave his assent to the plan he was assassinated as he was driving to his palace (March, 1881).

**746. The Balkan Wars.** The reign of Alexander II had not been entirely given up to internal reforms and repression, however. In 1877 Russia was again at war with Turkey, aiding the "south Slavs"—Serbians, Montenegrins, and Bulgarians—in their attempt to throw off the Turkish yoke. Successful in arms, Russia was, however, obliged to relinquish most of her gains and those of her allies by a congress of the European powers held at Berlin in 1878. But all this is described in the next chapter.

**747. Reaction under Alexander III.** While the body of the murdered Tsar, Alexander II, was still lying in state, the executive committee of the revolutionists issued a warning to his son and successor, Alexander III, threatening him with the evils to come if he did not yield to their demand for representative government, freedom of speech and of the press, and the right to meet for the discussion of political questions. The new Tsar was not, however, moved by the appeal, and the police redoubled their activity. The plans of reform were repudiated, and the autocracy settled back into its usual despotic habits. The terrorists realized that, for the time being, they had nothing to gain by further acts of violence, which would only serve to strengthen the government they were fighting. It was clear that the people at large were not yet ready for a revolution.

The reign of Alexander III (1881-1894) was a period of quiet, during which little progress seemed to be made. The people suffered the oppression of the government officials without active opposition. Their occasional protests were answered by imprisonment, flogging, or exile, for Alexander III and his intimate advisers believed quite as firmly and religiously in autocracy as Nicholas I had done. Freedom and liberalism, they agreed, could only serve to destroy a nation. All ideas of democracy which had produced revolutions in western Europe must be kept out at all cost.

### III. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

**748. The Industrial Revolution overtakes Russia.** It became increasingly difficult, however, to keep Russia "frozen," for during the last quarter of the nineteenth century the spread of democratic ideas had been hastened by the coming of the steam engine, the factory, and the locomotive, all of which served to unsettle the humdrum agricultural life which the great majority of the people had led for centuries. In spite of her mineral resources Russia had lagged far behind her Western neighbors in the use of machinery. She had little capital and no adequate means of transportation across the vast stretches of country that separated her chief towns, and the governing classes had no taste for manufacturing enterprises.

The liberation of the serfs, with all its drawbacks, favored the growth of factories, for the peasants were sometimes permitted to leave their villages for the manufacturing centers which were gradually growing up. The value of the products of the chief industries doubled between 1887 and 1897, and the number of people employed in them increased from 1,318,048 to 2,098,262. If Napoleon could have come once more to Moscow in 1912, he would not have recognized the city which met his gaze in 1812. It had become the center of the Russian textile industries, and the sound of a thousand looms and forges announced the creation of a new industrial world. St. Petersburg and Moscow each had more than a million inhabitants.

**749. Railway Construction in Russia.** Along with this business development went the construction of great railway lines, built largely by the government with money borrowed from capitalists in western Europe. Some of the railroads were constructed chiefly for political and military purposes, but others were designed to connect the great factory centers. Railway building was first seriously undertaken in Russia after the disasters of the Crimean War, when the soldiers suffered cruel hardships in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining supplies. By 1878 upward of eight thousand miles had been built, connecting the capital with the frontiers of European Russia. In 1885 the railway advance toward the frontiers of India<sup>1</sup> was begun, and within a short time Afghanistan was reached and communication opened to the borders of China. Important lines were also built in the region between the Black Sea and the Caspian.

**750. The Trans-Siberian Railroad.** The greatest of all railway undertakings was the Trans-Siberian road, which was rendered necessary for the transportation of soldiers and military supplies to the eastern boundary of the empire. Communication was established between St. Petersburg and the Pacific in 1900, and a branch line from Harbin southward to Port Arthur was soon finished.<sup>2</sup> One could, before the World War, travel in comfort, with few changes of cars, from Havre to Vladivostok, via Paris, Cologne, Berlin, Warsaw, Moscow, Irkutsk on Lake Baikal,

<sup>1</sup> The expansion of Russia to the southeast was very rapid. In 1846 the southern boundary ran along the lower edge of the Aral Sea. In 1863 Russia, claiming that the Turkestan tribesmen pillaged caravans and harried her frontiers, sent forces which captured the cities of Turkestan, Chemkent, and Tashkent, and two years later organized the region into the new province of Russian Turkestan. Shortly afterward the Ameer of Bokhara declared war on the Tsar, only to have the Russians occupy the ancient city of Samarkand and later establish a protectorate over Bokhara, which brought them to the borders of Afghanistan. In 1872 the Khan of Khiva was reduced to vassalage. During the following years (1873-1886) the regions to the south, about Merv, down to the borders of Persia and Afghanistan, were gradually annexed. In 1876 the province of Khokand on the boundary of the Chinese Empire was seized and transformed into the province of Ferghana. By securing railway concessions and making loans to the Shah the Russians became powerful in Persia, and thus all along their southeastern frontiers they struggled for predominance against British influence. In 1907 the British and Russian governments came to a settlement in regard to their spheres of influence in Persia.

<sup>2</sup> See map below, p. 436.




and Harbin, a distance of seventy-three hundred miles. In addition to the main line, some important branches were built, and more planned. By means of these the vast plains of central Asia may, before long, be peopled as the plains of America have been. Russian migration has been moving eastward.

#### IV. THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY UNDER NICHOLAS II

**751. Autocracy under Nicholas II.** When Nicholas II succeeded his father, Alexander III, in 1894,<sup>1</sup> he was but twenty-six years old, and there was some reason to hope that he would face the problems of this new industrial Russia in a progressive spirit. He had had an opportunity in his travels to become somewhat familiar with the enlightened governments of western Europe, and one of his first acts was to order the imprisonment of the prefect of police of St. Petersburg for annoying the correspondents of foreign newspapers. Nicholas, however, quickly dispelled any illusions which his more liberal subjects entertained. "Let it be understood by all," he declared, "that I shall employ all my powers in the best interests of the people, but the principle of autocracy will be sustained by me as firmly and unswervingly as it was by my never-to-be-forgotten father."

The censorship of the press was made stricter than ever, one decree alone adding two hundred books to the already long list of

<sup>1</sup> The Russian rulers from Catherine the Great to the last of the Tsars, Nicholas II, were as follows:



those which the government condemned.<sup>1</sup> The distinguished historian Professor Milyoukoff was dismissed from the University of Moscow on the ground of his "generally noxious tendencies," and other teachers were warned not to talk about government.<sup>2</sup>

**752. Russifying Finland.** Nowhere did the Tsar show his desire for absolute control more clearly than in his dealings with



FIG. 103. HARBIN, A CITY ON THE TRANS-SIBERIAN RAILWAY

Cities have sprung up along the great Russian railway just as they did along the transcontinental lines in the United States or Canada. This Western-looking town is northeast of Peking, in the farming country of Manchuria, nominally a part of the Chinese Republic but in reality held by Russia

Finland. When Alexander I had annexed that country in 1809 he had permitted it to retain its own diet and pass its own laws, although it of course recognized the Tsar as its ruler under the title of Grand Duke. The Finns cherished their independence and have in recent times shown themselves one of the most progressive peoples of Europe. In 1899, however, Nicholas began a harsh

<sup>1</sup> Among the books which the government prohibited in public libraries were the Russian translations of Mill's *Political Economy*, Green's *History of the English People*, and Bryce's *American Commonwealth*.

<sup>2</sup> One may judge of the sober, high-minded scholars upon whom the Russian autocracy believed it essential to make war by reading Professor Milyoukoff's *Russia and its Crisis*, which is based on a series of lectures which he delivered in the United States during the year 1903-1904.

and determined *Russification* of Finland. He sent heartless officials, like Plehve, to represent him and crush out all opposition to his changes. He undertook to substitute the Russian language so far as possible for the Finnish.

Finally, on June 17, 1904, the Russian governor of Finland was assassinated by the son of one of the senators, who then killed himself, leaving a letter in which he explained that he had acted



FIG. 104. NICHOLAS II

alone and with the simple purpose of forcing on the Tsar's attention the atrocities of his officials. A year later the Tsar, under the influence of revolution at home and disaster abroad, consented to restore to Finland all her former rights.

**753. The Harsh Rule of Plehve.** We must now trace the history of the terrible struggle between the Russian people and their despotic government, which began openly in 1904. In 1902 an unpopular minister of the interior had been assassinated, and the Tsar

had appointed a still more unpopular man in his place, namely, Plehve, who was notorious for his success in hunting down those who criticized the government and for the vigor with which he had carried on the Russification of Finland.

**754. Massacres of the Jews.** Plehve connived at the persecution of those among the Tsar's subjects who ventured to disagree with the doctrines of the Russian official Church, to which every Russian was supposed to belong. The Jews suffered especially. There were massacres at Kishinev and elsewhere in 1903 which horrified the Western world and drove hundreds of

preparation & even learnt your language & will in no way be of any hindrance to your generals, as he is a quiet man, as the crowd is large & powerful I think that it does not matter if he goes, as it venture again to ask whether you can permit him to go.

With excuses for bothering you with all these matters, but they are better changed between us & best be to

Fare you

I love you most aff = as in & friend

Willy.

NOTE. The Kaiser and the Tsar carried on for many years an informal, nonofficial correspondence with one another in English. "Willy," who was nearly ten years the older, gives "Nicky" much advice.

Berlin 15 I 1905



Dear Nicky.

The widow of old Prince Antoine Romanoff, Princess Marie, is going to Petersburg, to beg for your approval of her late husband's will. Prince Antoine was not only a cherished & trusted servant of my deceased grandfather, as his Adjutant & Assistant General, but also a faithful & beloved personal friend to him as well as to my late beloved father & to me. His winning ways & his gay nature and as his chivalrous character won him friends wherever he was, & your grandfather & father have both always cherished him. His wife was the intimate long-life friend of my late mother, & has been made testatrix by her husband for his will. The whole future of her children & family rests on the fact of your kind approval of the will, & I venture

FIG. 105. OPENING AND CLOSE OF A WILLY AND NICKY LETTER  
Courtesy of the Chicago Daily News



thousands of Jews to foreign lands, especially to the United States. There is good reason to believe that Plehve actually arranged these massacres. At all events he continued to tolerate them until a bomb put an end to his career in the summer of 1904.

**755. The Liberals, or Constitutional Democrats.** Plehve was mistaken, however, in his belief that all the trouble came from a handful of deluded fanatics. Among those who detested the cruel and corrupt government which he represented were the professional men, the university professors, the enlightened merchants and manufacturers, and the public-spirited nobility. These were not at first organized into a distinct party, but in time they came to be known as the *Constitutional Democrats*. They hoped that a parliament elected by the people might be established. They demanded freedom of speech and of the press, the right to hold public meetings to discuss public questions, the abolition of the secret police system and of arbitrary imprisonment and religious persecutions.

**756. The Social Democrats.** In the towns a socialistic party had been growing up which advocated the theories of Karl Marx (§ 447). It desired all the reforms advocated by the Constitutional Democrats just described, but looked forward to the time when the workingmen would become so numerous and powerful that they could seize the government offices and assume the management of lands, mines, and factories, which should thereafter be used for the benefit of all rather than for the small class of rich men who then owned them. Unlike the reformers next to be described, they did not believe in terrorism or in murderous attacks upon unpopular government officials.

**757. The Socialist Revolutionary Party.** In contrast with these were those Russian agitators who belonged to the Socialist Revolutionary party, which was well organized and was responsible for the chief acts of violence during the years of the revolution. They maintained that it was right to make war upon the government, which was oppressing them and extorting money from the people to fill the pockets of dishonest officeholders. Its members selected their victims from the most notoriously cruel

among the officials, and after a victim had been killed they usually published a list of the offenses which cost him his life. Lists of those selected for assassination were also prepared, after careful consideration, by their executive committee.

**758. Russian Reverses in the War with Japan.** The more the Tsar sought to stamp out all protest against the autocracy, the more its enemies increased, and at last, in 1904, the open revolution may be said to have begun. On February 5 of that year a war commenced with Japan (§§ 812-814 below), which was due to Russia's encroachments in Korea and her evident intention of permanently depriving China of Manchuria. The liberals attributed the conflict to bad management on the part of the Tsar's officials and declared it to be inhuman and contrary to the interests of the people. Whatever the cause, disaster was the outcome. The Japanese defeated the Russians in Manchuria in a series of terrific conflicts. The Russian fleets in the East were annihilated, and on January 1, 1905, Port Arthur fell, after one of the most terrible sieges on record.

**759. Distress and Revolution.** The war produced a panic in business and trade, and strikes became common. At the same time the crops failed, and the starving peasants burned and robbed the houses and barns of the nobles. It became known that the government officials had been stealing money that should have gone to strengthen and equip the armies; rifles had been paid for that had never been delivered, supplies bought which never reached the suffering soldiers, and—most scandalous of all—high Russian dignitaries had even misappropriated the funds of the Red Cross Society for aiding the wounded.

**760. "Red Sunday," January 22, 1905.** On Sunday, January 22, 1905, a fearful event occurred. The workmen of St. Petersburg had sent a petition to the Tsar and had informed him that on Sunday they would march to the palace humbly to pray him in person to consider their sufferings, since they had no faith in his officials or ministers. When Sunday morning came, masses of men, women, and children, wholly unarmed, attempted to approach the Winter Palace in the pathetic hope that the "Little

Father," as they called the Tsar, would listen to their woes. Instead, the Cossacks tried to disperse them with their whips, and then the troops which guarded the palace shot and cut down hundreds and wounded thousands in a conflict which continued all day. "Red Sunday" was, however, only the most impressive of many similar encounters between citizens and the Tsar's police.




FIG. 106. THE WINTER PALACE, ST. PETERSBURG

The massacre took place just in front of the palace

**761. Protest of the Men of Letters.** The day after "Red Sunday" all the leading lawyers and men of letters in St. Petersburg joined in the following declaration: "The public should understand that the government has declared war on the entire Russian people. There is no further doubt on this point. A government which is unable to hold intercourse with the people except with the assistance of sabers and rifles is self-condemned. We summon all the vital energies of Russian society to the assistance of the workingmen who began the struggle for the common cause of the whole people."

**762. The Tsar Forced to promise Reforms.** Finally the Tsar so far yielded to the pressure of public opinion that on August 19 he promised to summon a *Duma*, or council, which should meet not later than January, 1906. It was to represent all Russia, but to have

no further power than that of giving the ruler advice in making the laws, for the Tsar refused to give up his old autocratic prerogatives.

This was a bitter disappointment to even the most moderate liberals. It was pointed out that both the workingmen and the professional men were excluded by the regulations from voting. A more effective measure in bringing the Tsar and his advisers to terms was a great general strike in the interest of reform which began late in October. All the railroads stopped running; in all the great towns the shops, except those that dealt in provisions, were closed; gas and electricity were no longer furnished; the law courts ceased their duties; and even the apothecaries refused to prepare prescriptions until reforms should be granted.

The situation soon became intolerable, and on October 29 the Tsar announced that he had ordered "the government" to grant the people freedom of conscience, speech, and association, and to permit the classes which had been excluded in his first edict to vote for members of the Duma. Lastly, he agreed "to establish an immutable rule that no law can come into force without the approval of the Duma."

**763. The Duma Dissolved.** The elections for the Duma took place in March and April, 1906, and, in spite of the activity of the police, resulted in an overwhelming majority for the Constitutional Democrats. The deputies to the Duma assembled in no humble frame of mind. Like the members of the Estates General in 1789 (§ 210), they felt that they had the nation behind them. They listened stonily to the Tsar's remarks at the opening session, and it was clear from the first that they would not agree any better with their monarch than the French deputies had agreed with Louis XVI and his courtiers.

The Tsar's ministers would not coöperate with the Duma in any important measures of reform, and on July 21 Nicholas II declared that he was "cruelly disappointed" because the deputies had not confined themselves to their proper duties and had commented upon many matters which belonged to him. He accordingly dissolved the Duma, as he had a perfect right to do, and fixed March 5, 1907, as the date for the meeting of a new Duma.



**764. Atrocities and Disorder Continue.** The revolutionists made an unsuccessful attempt in August to blow up the Tsar's chief minister in his country house and continued to assassinate governors and police officials. The "Black Hundreds," on the other hand, murdered Jews and liberals, while the government established courts-martial to insure the speedy trial and immediate execution of revolutionists. In the two months September and October, 1906, these courts summarily condemned three hundred persons to be shot or hanged. During the whole year some nine thousand persons were killed or wounded for political reasons.

**765. Famine added to the Other Disasters.** A terrible famine was afflicting the land at the end of the year, and it was discovered that a member of the Tsar's ministry had been stealing the money appropriated to furnish grain to the dying peasants. An observer who had traveled eight hundred miles through the famine-stricken district reported that he did not find a single village where the peasants had food enough for themselves or their cattle. In some places the peasants were reduced to eating bark and the straw used for their thatch roofs.

**766. Village Communities Broken Up.** In October, 1906, a decree permitted the peasants to leave their particular village community and join another or to seek employment elsewhere. On November 25 the peasants were empowered to become owners of their allotments, and all unpaid dues were annulled. This constituted the first step toward a practical abolition of the system of common ownership by village communities, described above, which was finally achieved by a law of June 27, 1910. This was the beginning of the great social changes in Russia.

**767. The Duma and the Autocracy.** The Tsar continued to summon the Duma regularly, but so arranged the system of voting for its members that only the conservative classes of the nation were represented, and his officials did all they could to keep out liberal deputies. In spite of this the fourth Duma, elected in 1912, showed much independence in opposing the oppressive rule of the Tsar's ministers. Although parliamentary government was by no means won in Russia, many important reforms were




FIG. 107. TSAR NICHOLAS II AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST DUMA



achieved. The Tsar, however, continued to retain the title of "Autocrat of all the Russias," and his officials went on persecuting those who ventured to criticize the government, until the revolution of March, 1917, deprived them of all power (see §§ 989-993 below).

### QUESTIONS

I. Explain the racial problem which confronted the Russian government. Why have the Tsars of Russia borne the title of "Autocrat of all the Russias"? Account for the changed attitude of Alexander I after 1815. Tell of the revolt of the Poles under Nicholas I.

II. Describe the life of the Russian serfs. What change in their condition resulted from the emancipation proclamation of 1861? Define nihilism. Account for the origin of terrorism.

III. What were the effects of the Industrial Revolution in Russia? Show on a map the advance of Russia to the southeast and the line of the Trans-Siberian railroad.

IV. Describe the attempt to Russify Finland. Outline the platforms of the three great political parties of Russia. Describe the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. What was "Red Sunday"? Mention the other important events of the year 1905.

Describe the first session of the Duma. Describe the conditions in Russia after the first Duma was dissolved. What change in the life of the peasant resulted from the decree of November, 1906?

### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) the liberal ideas of Alexander I, pp. 338-342; (2) the abolition of serfdom, pp. 345-352; (3) the growth of revolutionary ideas, pp. 353-367; (4) the revolutionary movement in the reign of Nicholas II, pp. 371-381.

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) reform and the rise of terrorism, pp. 452-460; (2) autocratic Russia, pp. 460-473; (3) the revival of the revolutionary spirit and the creation of the Duma, pp. 473-487. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) the reigns of Alexander I and Nicholas I, pp. 501-513; (5) the rise of the revolutionary movement, pp. 513-523; (6) autocratic Russia—races, government, and police system, pp. 524-545; (7) the revolution of 1905, pp. 547-569.



## CHAPTER XXIII

### TURKEY AND THE EASTERN QUESTION

#### I. THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

**768. Turkey a Source of European Conflict.** In our narrative reference has been made now and again to the Sultan of Turkey, and especially to his troubles with his neighbors, Russia and Austria. In order to understand this "Eastern question"—which has involved the gradual expulsion of the Turks from Europe, the interminable quarrel over the Sultan's government and finances, and the formation of the new states of Serbia, Rumania, Greece, and Bulgaria—it is necessary to turn back, for the moment, to the origin of the Turkish empire in Europe.

**769. The Rise of Turkish Power in Europe.** Although there had been an almost steady conflict between the Cross and the Crescent ever since the days of Mohammed, it was not until the fourteenth century that southeastern Europe was threatened by a Mohammedan invasion. Under successive sultans the Ottoman Turks extended their dominion into Asia Minor, Syria, Arabia, and Egypt, while to the west they conquered the Balkan regions and Greece. In 1453 the capital of the Eastern Empire, Constantinople, fell into their hands, and for two hundred and fifty years thereafter they were a source of serious apprehension to the states of western Europe.

**770. Austria and Russia Drive back the Turks.** The Turks pushed up the valley of the Danube almost to the borders of the Holy Roman Empire, and for nearly two centuries the republic of Venice and the Hapsburg rulers of Austria were engaged in an almost continuous war with them. In 1683 they laid siege to Vienna, but were defeated with the help of the Polish king, who came to the relief of the Austrians. By the end of the century (1699) the Turks were finally expelled from Hungary.

While Turkey ceased, thereafter, to be dangerously aggressive, she was able for several decades to resist the efforts of Russia and Austria to deprive her of further territory. In 1774 Catherine the Great managed to secure the Crimea and the region about the Sea of Azof, thus giving Russia a permanent foothold on the Black Sea. Moreover the Porte, as the Turkish government is commonly called, conceded to Russia the right to protect the Sultan's Christian subjects, most of whom were adherents of the Orthodox Greek Church, the State Church of Russia (§ 736 and n.).

These and other provisions seemed to give the Russians an excuse for intervening in Turkish affairs, and offered an opportunity for fomenting discontent among the Sultan's Christian subjects. In 1812, just before Napoleon's march on Moscow, Alexander I forced Turkey to cede to him Bessarabia on the Black Sea, which remained the last of Russia's conquests toward the southwest.

**771. The Emergence of Serbia.** Shortly after the Congress of Vienna the Serbians, who had for a number of years been in revolt against the Turks, were able to establish their practical independence (1817), and Serbia, with Belgrade as its capital, became a principality tributary to Turkey. This was the first of a series of Balkan states which have emerged, during the nineteenth century, from beneath the Mohammedan inundation.

**772. Greece Declares Independence (1822).** The next state to gain its independence was Greece, whose long conflict against Turkish despotism aroused throughout Europe the sympathy of all who appreciated the glories of ancient Greece. The inhabitants of the land of Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes were, it is true, scarcely to be regarded as descendants of the Greeks, and the language they spoke bore little resemblance to the ancient tongue. At the opening of the nineteenth century, however, the national spirit once more awoke in Greece, and able writers made modern Greek a literary language and employed it in stirring appeals to the patriotism of their fellow countrymen.

In 1821 an insurrection broke out in Morea, as the ancient Peloponnesus is now called. The revolutionists were supported by

the clergy of the Greek Church, who proclaimed a savage war of extermination against the infidel. The movement spread through the peninsula; the atrocities of the Turk were rivaled by those of the Greeks, and thousands of Mohammedans—men, women, and children—were slaughtered. On January 27, 1822, the Greek National Assembly issued a proclamation of independence.

**773. Sympathy of Western Europe for Greek Independence.** To Metternich this revolt seemed only another illustration of the dangers of revolution, but the liberals throughout Europe enthusiastically sympathized with the Greek uprising, since it was carried on in the name of national liberty. Intellectual men in England, France, Germany, and the United States held meetings to express sympathy for the cause, while to the ardent Christian it seemed a righteous war against infidels and persecutors. Soldiers and supplies poured into Greece. Indeed, the Greeks could scarcely have freed themselves had the European powers refused to intervene.

**774. Independence of Greece Established (1832).** It is needless to follow the long negotiations between the various European courts in connection with Greek affairs. In 1827 England, France, and Russia signed a treaty at London providing for a joint adjustment of the difficulty, on the ground that it was necessary to put an end to the sanguinary struggle which left Greece and the adjacent islands a prey "to all the disasters of anarchy, and daily causes fresh impediments to the commerce of Europe." The Porte having refused to accept the mediation of the allies, their combined fleets destroyed that of the Sultan at Navarino in October, 1827. Thereupon the Porte declared a "holy war" on the unbelievers, especially the Russians. But the latter were prepared to push the war with vigor, and they not only actively promoted the freedom of Greece but forced the Sultan to grant practical independence to the Danubian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, which came thereby under Russian influence and later were united into the kingdom of Rumania. Turkey was no longer able to oppose the wishes of the allies, and in 1832 Greece became an independent state, choosing for its king Prince Otto of Bavaria.

## II. THE CRIMEAN WAR (1854-1856)

**775. The Protection of Christians in Turkey.** A fresh excuse for interfering in Turkish affairs was afforded the Tsar in 1853. Complaints reached him that Christian pilgrims were not permitted by the Turks (who had long been in possession of the Holy Land and Jerusalem) freely to visit the places made sacred by their associations with the life of Jesus. Russia seemed the natural protector of those, at least, who adhered to her own form of Christianity, and the Russian ambassador rudely demanded that the Porte should grant the Tsar a protectorate over all the Christians in Turkey.

**776. France and England declare War on Russia.** When news of this situation reached Paris, Napoleon III, who had recently become emperor and was anxious to take a hand in European affairs, declared that France, in virtue of earlier treaties with the Porte, enjoyed the right to protect Catholic Christians. He found an ally in England, who feared that if Russia took Constantinople it would command the route to India, and who accordingly advised the Sultan not to accede to Russia's demands. When the Tsar's troops marched into the Turkish dominions France and England came to the Sultan's assistance and declared war upon Russia in 1854.

**777. The Crimean War (1854).** The Crimean War, which followed, owes its name to the fact that the operations of the allies against Russia culminated in the long and bloody siege of Sebastopol, in the southern part of the Crimean peninsula. Every victory won by the allies was dearly bought. The English soldiers suffered at first in consequence of the inefficiency of the home government in sending them the necessary supplies. The charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava, which has been made famous by Tennyson's poem, and the engagement at Inkerman were small compensation for the immense losses and hardships endured by both the French and the English. Russia was, however, disheartened by the sufferings of her own soldiers, the inefficiency and corruption of her officials, and the final loss of the mighty fortress of



Sevastopol. She saw, moreover, that her near neighbor, Austria, was about to join her enemies. The new Tsar, Alexander II,



FIG. 108. FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE

The most famous of nurses was a wealthy English woman who, having studied medicine and directed a hospital of her own, took with her some forty nurses to the Crimea, where the soldiers were suffering from cholera as well as from wounds. Her heroic work won her the devotion of the soldiers. The Red Cross organization for nursing soldiers dates only from an international convention at Geneva in 1864, which arranged that such nurses should not be fired on in battle

therefore, consented in 1856 to the terms of a treaty drawn up at Paris.<sup>1</sup>

**778. Terms of the Treaty of Paris (1856).** This treaty recognized the independence of the Ottoman Empire and guaranteed its territorial integrity. The "Sublime Porte" was also admitted to the circle of the Christian nations of Europe, from which it had hitherto been excluded as a barbarous government, and the other powers agreed not to interfere further with the domestic affairs of Turkey.

The Black Sea was declared neutral territory and its waters were thrown open to merchant ships of all nations, but no warships were to pass through the Bosphorus or Dardanelles. In short, Turkey was preserved and strengthened by the intervention of the powers as a bulwark against Russian encroachment into

the Balkan peninsula, but, although the Sultan made liberal promises, nothing was really done to reform the Turkish administration or to make the lot of the Christian subjects more secure.

<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that Sardinia had joined the allies against Russia, and in this way forced the powers to admit it to the deliberations at Paris, where Cavour seized the opportunity to plead the cause of Italy. See above, § 500.

## III. REVOLTS IN THE BALKAN PENINSULA

**779. Turkish Atrocities in the Balkans.** Some idea of the situation of the people under the Sultan's rule may be derived from the report of an English traveler (Mr. Arthur Evans) in 1875. In the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina he found that outside the large towns, where European consuls were present, there was no safety for the honor, property, or lives of the Christians, because the authorities were blind to any outrage committed by a Mohammedan. The Sultan's taxes fell principally on the peasants, in the form of a tenth of their produce. It was a common custom for the collectors (who were often not Mohammedans but brutal Christians) to require the peasant to pay the tax in cash before the harvesting of the ripe crop, and if he could not meet the charges, the taxgatherer simply said, "Then your harvest shall rot on the ground till you pay it." When this oppression was resisted, the most cruel punishments were meted out to the offenders.

**780. The Bulgarian Atrocities (1876).** In 1874 a failure of crops aggravated the intolerable conditions and an insurrection broke out in Bosnia and Herzegovina which set the whole Balkan peninsula aflame. The Bulgarians around Philippopolis, incited to hopes of independence by the events in the regions to the west of them, assassinated some of the Turkish officials and gave the Ottoman government a pretext for the most terrible atrocities in the history of Turkish rule in Europe, the murder of thousands of Bulgarians.

**781. The Position of England.** While the European powers were exchanging futile diplomatic notes on the situation, Serbia and Montenegro declared war on the Sultan, and the Christians in the Balkan region made a frantic appeal to the West for immediate help. A good deal naturally depended on the position taken by England, which was in alliance with Turkey. Gladstone, then leader of the Liberals, urged his countrymen to break the unholy alliance between England and "the unspeakable Turk." But Gladstone's party was not in power, and Lord Beaconsfield was

fearful that English encouragement to the Slavic rebels in the Sultan's dominions would only result in their becoming independent and allying themselves with England's enemy, Russia. The English believed that in the interest of their trade they must continue to resist any movement which might destroy the power of the Sultan, who was not so likely as a European power, like Russia or Austria, to hamper their eastern commerce.

**782. Russia Defeats Turkey (1877-1878).** The negotiations of the powers having come to nothing, Russia determined, in 1877, to act alone. Her declaration of war was shortly followed by Russian victories, and in 1878 a Russian army entered Adrianople—which was equivalent to an announcement to the world that Ottoman dominion in Europe had come to an end. England protested, but the Sultan was forced to sign the Treaty of San Stefano with the Tsar and to recognize the complete independence of Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania.<sup>1</sup> As for Bulgaria, it was made an independent state except for the payment of tribute to the Sultan.

**783. The Congress of Berlin (1878).** England and Austria had naturally serious objections to this treaty, which increased the influence of Russia in the Balkans. They therefore forced Tsar Alexander II to submit the whole matter to the consideration of a general European congress at Berlin, where, after prolonged and stormy sessions, the powers agreed that Serbia, Rumania, and little Montenegro should be entirely independent and that Bulgaria should also be independent except for the payment of a tribute to the Sultan. The Tsar was permitted to annex a district to the east of the Black Sea, including the towns of Batum and Kars. The provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary.<sup>2</sup> This proved an important decision, as we shall see later.

<sup>1</sup> In 1862 the so-called "Danubian provinces" of Moldavia and Wallachia had formed a voluntary union under the name "Rumania." In 1866 the Rumanians chose for their ruler a German prince, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, who, in 1881, was proclaimed king of Rumania, as Carol I. He died in 1914 and was succeeded by his nephew Ferdinand.

<sup>2</sup> They were finally annexed by Austria-Hungary in 1908. See § 936 below.

**784. Bulgarian Independence.** The territorial settlement at Berlin, like that at Vienna half a century before, disregarded many national aspirations. The Bulgarians were especially disappointed with the arrangement, for, instead of being all united in one state, as they had hoped, only the region between the Danube and the Balkan Mountains, with some slight additions, was recognized as the principality of Bulgaria. Those Bulgarians dwelling just south of the Balkan range in the province of Eastern Rumelia were still subjects of the Sultan, although under a Christian governor-general. As for Macedonia and the region about Adrianople, where there were also many Bulgarians, it was left under the direct administration of Turkish officials.

Under the terms of the treaty the inhabitants of the Bulgarian principality proceeded to frame a constitution and chose, as their prince, Alexander of Battenberg (succeeded by Ferdinand of Coburg in 1886). They adopted as their watchword "Bulgaria for the Bulgarians," and took the first step toward the reunion of their race by a bloodless revolution, in 1885, which joined Eastern Rumelia to Bulgaria. At length, in 1908, they refused to pay the Sultan's tribute and took their place among the independent nations of the world.

**785. European Turkey in 1900.** Thus the Turkish empire in Europe was cut down to a narrow strip of territory—less in extent than the state of Missouri—extending from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, and confined mainly to a region commonly called "Macedonia." This area was broken everywhere by mountain ranges and is inhabited by such a complicated mixture of races that it has been aptly called "a perfect ethnographic museum." Its population embraced Bulgarians, Serbs, Greeks, and Albanians, some of them Mohammedan in religion, but most of them Christian. Nearly all of them chafed under Turkish rule, conspired against it, and prepared for the day of emancipation. The further developments in the Balkan region were closely associated with the general history of Europe and played a great part in the outbreak of the World War. They will consequently be considered later, in Chapter XXVIII.



## QUESTIONS

I. Outline the rise and fall of Turkish power in Europe. Describe the relations between Russia and Turkey in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. What state in Europe first freed itself from the yoke of Turkey? Give a short history of the Greek struggle for independence. Describe the part played in this war by Great Britain, France, and Russia. Which of the Balkan states owes its origin to the war of Greek independence?

II. What circumstances led to the Crimean War? Give the terms of the Treaty of Paris, 1856.

III. Describe conditions in Bosnia and Herzegovina under Turkish rule. What was Gladstone's attitude on the Turkish question? State the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano. Mention the most important changes made in the treaty by the Congress of Berlin, 1878. What are the two most important events in Bulgarian history since this date? What was the extent of European Turkey at the end of the nineteenth century?

## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II; (1) the independence of Greece, pp. 382-388; (2) the Crimean War, pp. 389-394; (3) the Balkan situation, pp. 394-403.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Serbia, Greece, Crimean War, Florence Nightingale, Bulgaria, Berlin (Congress of), and Turkey (later phases of its history).

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the old Ottoman Empire, pp. 490-498; (2) the dismemberment of Turkey, pp. 498-509; (3) the Balkan states and Turkey, pp. 515-528. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (4) the Ottoman Empire and its dissolution, pp. 621-635; (5) the development of national rivalries in the Near East, pp. 635-646.





20° 30° 40° 50° 60° 70° 80°

Baltic Sea, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Warsaw, Berlin, Danube R., Odessa, Constantinople, Black Sea, Turkish Empire, Armenia, Caucasus Mts., Tiflis, Trans-Caspian Prov., Ural Mts., Tobolsk, Omsk, Akmolinsk, Semipalatinsk, L. Balkash, Turkistan, Russian, Khiva, Tashkent, Bukhara, Kokand, Yarkand, Eastern, Samarkand, Merv, Kushk, Kabul, Herat, Persian Sphere, Persian Gulf, Baghdad, Teheran, Russian Sphere, Persian Gulf, British Sphere, Bandar Abbas, Kalat, Baluchistan, Arabian Sea, India, Delhi, Bombay, Durr, Goa (Port.), Aden, Gulf of Aden, Socotra I., Kuria Muria Is. (Str.), Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Damascus, Aleppo, Euphrates R., Tigris R., Cyprus, Mediterranean Sea, Suez Canal, Port. Sa., Yezd, Basra, Kowelt, Bahrein I. (Br.), Phindab, Sind, Hyderabad, M., Po., Ka., C.









## CHAPTER XXIV

### EUROPEAN INTERESTS IN THE FAR EAST

#### I. RELATIONS OF EUROPE WITH CHINA

**786. The Far-Eastern Question.** We have seen in the last chapter how the struggles in the Balkan region became matters of concern for the western European states and how at the Congress of Berlin an effort was made to settle the "Eastern question" as it was called. We shall see later how the old rivalries were revived in the early twentieth century and led directly to the World War, in which nearly all the peoples of the globe became involved. Meanwhile a "Far-Eastern question" was arising, owing to European relations with China and Japan. These new complications of world politics are the subject of the present chapter.

**787. Early European Relations with China.** The relations of Europe to China extend back into ancient times. Some of the Roman emperors, including Marcus Aurelius (Vol. I, § 422), sent embassies to the Chinese monarch, and in the Middle Ages some missionaries labored to introduce Christianity into China. It was not, however, until after the opening of the water route around the Cape of Good Hope that European trade with China became important (Vol. I, § 673). Early in the sixteenth century Portuguese merchants appeared in Chinese harbors, offering Western merchandise in exchange for tea and silks. In 1537 the Portuguese rented a trifling bit of land of Macao, off Canton—a post which they hold to-day.

However, the Chinese did not welcome foreign interference. Their officials regarded the European merchants as barbarians. When, in 1655, the Dutch sent two envoys to the Chinese emperor, they were received only on condition that they would prostrate themselves before his throne and strike their heads nine times on the earth as evidence of their inferiority. Nevertheless Dutch

and English merchants flocked to Canton, the sole port at which the Chinese emperor permitted business with foreign countries.

**788. The "Opium War."** Repeated efforts were made, particularly by the English, to get into direct communication with the government at Peking, but they were steadily rebuffed and were




FIG. 109. THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA AT THE NANKOW PASS

This great wall, fifteen to thirty feet high and fifteen to twenty-five feet broad, extends for fourteen hundred miles along the northern borders of China. Part of it was built in the third century B.C., part in the fourteenth century of the Christian Era, as a barrier to the Tartar tribes. The civilization of China is very old, and the Chinese have been proudly disdainful of Western ways and inventions until recently, when nations supplied with these inventions have been threatening the very independence of China

only able to establish the commercial relations which they sought by an armed conflict in 1840, known as the "Opium War." The Chinese had attempted to prevent all traffic in this drug, but the English found it so profitable that they were unwilling to give up the trade. When, in 1839, the Chinese government seized many thousand chests of opium and informed the British that the traffic would have to stop, war broke out.

**789. The Opening of Treaty Ports.** The British, of course, with their modern implements of warfare, were speedily victorious, and the Chinese were forced to agree, in the Treaty of Nanking, to pay a heavy indemnity, to cede to the British the island of Hong-kong, which lies at the mouth of the Canton River, and to open to foreign commerce the ports of Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai on the same terms as Canton. The United States, taking advantage of this war, secured similar commercial privileges in 1844.

From the Opium War onward China was troubled with foreign invasions. Napoleon III, supported by the English, waged war on China in 1858 and forced the emperor to open new ports to European trade, including Tientsin, which was dangerously near the imperial city of Peking. As time went on China was to a great extent opened to foreign merchants, and the "concessions" demanded by the great powers became a danger to China and a threat to European peace, as we shall see later.

## II. JAPAN BECOMES A WORLD POWER; INTERVENTION IN CHINA

**790. The Strange History of Japan.** To the northeast of China lies a long group of islands which, if they lay off the eastern coast of North America, would extend from Maine to Georgia. This archipelago, comprising four main islands and some four thousand smaller ones, is the Japanese Empire. Fifty years ago Japan was still almost completely isolated from the rest of the world; but now, through a series of extraordinary events, she has become one of the conspicuous members of the family of nations. American newspapers deal as fully with her foreign policy as with that of France or Germany, especially in view of American interests in the Pacific Ocean and the Japanese question in California. We are familiar with the portraits of her statesmen and warriors, and her exquisite art has many enthusiastic admirers in England and America. Her people, who are somewhat more numerous than the inhabitants of the British Isles, resemble the



Chinese in appearance and owe to China the beginnings of their culture and their art, for it was Buddhist missionaries from Korea who, in the sixth century, first aroused Japan from its previous barbarism.

791. **The Feudal Period in Japan.** Little is known of the early Mikados (emperors) of Japan, and during the twelfth




FIG. 110. JAPANESE FEUDAL CASTLE

Contrast this stronghold of feudal days in Japan with the grim castles of Europe in the Middle Ages. Rival parties among the Japanese nobles now contend only in parliament

century the *Shogun*, or commander in chief of the empire, was able to bring the sovereign powers into his own hands, and the emperor began to live in retirement in his capital of Kyoto. Conditions in Japan resembled those in western Europe during the same period. Scattered about the country were the castles of powerful feudal lords (the *daimios*), who continued, until the nineteenth century, to enjoy powers similar to the vassals of the medieval European kings.

Rumors of the existence of Japan reached Europe through the Venetian traveler Marco Polo at the end of the thirteenth century (Vol. I, § 672), but the Portuguese navigator Pinto appears to have been the first European to reach Japan, in the year 1542. Some years later the great Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier, accompanied by some Japanese who had been converted to Christianity at Goa, made the first attempt to preach the Christian faith in the islands. Spanish missionaries from Manila carried on the work, and it is reported that within thirty years two hundred Christian churches had been erected and fifty thousand converts made.



FIG. III. JAPANESE WARRIORS

The men who led the Japanese armies in the great war with Russia had learned, as boys, to fight in armor with sword and spear, like these warriors

**792. Christian Missionaries Expelled.** The arrogance of the bishops, however, led the Japanese government to issue an edict in 1586 forbidding the Japanese to accept Christianity, and ten years later some twenty thousand converts are said to have been put to death. For a time the Shoguns favored the few Dutch and English merchants who came to their shores and permitted European agencies to be opened at Yedo and elsewhere, but the quarrels between the Dutch and English and the constant drain of silver paid out for foreign merchandise led the Japanese to impose restrictions on foreigners, so that in the time of Louis XIV all of them had departed except a few Dutch. From that time on, for nearly two hundred years, Japan remained a nation apart, with practically no intercourse with foreigners.

**793. The United States opens Japan.** In 1853 Commodore Perry visited Yokohama with a message from the United States government to the "Sovereign of Japan," asking that arrangements be made to protect the property and persons of Americans wrecked on the coasts, and that the right be extended to Americans to dispose of their cargoes at one or more ports. Supposing that the Shogun was the ruler of Japan, Commodore Perry presented his demands to him. These led to a long and earnest discussion in the Shogun's council as to whether foreigners should be admitted or not, but their demands were finally granted, and two ports were opened to American and English ships.

**794. The Japanese have a Change of Heart.** Within the next few years several of the European powers had arranged to trade at three or four of the ports (Hakodate, Yokohama, Nagasaki, and a little later at Kobe). Attacks, however, were made upon foreigners in the name of the emperor, who disapproved the Shogun's action. An Englishman by the name of Richardson was killed in 1862, on the great highroad between Tokyo and Kyoto, by the retainers of the powerful daimio of Satsuma, whereupon the English bombarded Kagoshima, the stronghold of the Satsuma clan.

This produced an extraordinary change of heart in this leading clan, one of the most powerful in Japan, for it saw that the foreigners were much more powerful than the Japanese, and that Japan would suffer as China had done unless she acquainted herself with foreign science and inventions. The next year English ships bombarded another port (Shimonoseki), on account of the refusal of its feudal ruler to permit them to pass freely through the Inland Sea. This produced an effect similar to the bombardment of Kagoshima, and public opinion in Japan gradually changed in favor of the admission of foreigners.

**795. Feudalism abolished in Japan.** In 1867 the Mikado, Mutsuhito (d. 1912), then fifteen years of age, ascended the throne. In March of the next year he invited Sir Harry Parkes, a representative of Great Britain, as well as the representatives of France and the Netherlands, to Kyoto. He was deeply pained by an attack made upon the party of Sir Harry Parkes and






FIG. 112. JAPANESE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN SESSION

This drawing, by a Japanese artist, shows the extent to which Japan is being Westernized



publicly declared that anyone who committed any deed of violence against foreigners would be acting in opposition to his Majesty's express orders. With this episode the period of resistance to the foreigners, their trade and their religion, may be said to have closed.

Meanwhile a great revolution was taking place in Japan; the power of the Shogun was rapidly declining, and in October, 1867, he was forced to resign his office. This left the Mikado not only the nominal but the real ruler of Japan. He emerged from his ancient seclusion in the sacred city of Kyoto and removed the capital to Yedo, which was given the new name of Tokyo, or "eastern capital." The feudal princes, who had, in general, sided with the Mikado against the Shogun, now agreed peacefully to surrender their titles and prerogatives in the interests of their country, and in July, 1871, feudalism was formally abolished throughout the empire. Serfdom was also done away with and—a fact of great importance—the army and navy were reformed in accordance with Western models.

**796. The Industrial Revolution in Japan.** Since that date the modernizing of Japan has progressed with incredible rapidity. Although the Japanese still continue to carry on their ancient industries, kneeling on their straw mats, with a few simple implements and no machinery, Western industries have been introduced side by side with the older arts. Students were sent abroad to investigate the most recent achievements in science, a university was established at Tokyo, and the system of education completely revolutionized. There was not a steam factory in the islands when Commodore Perry cast anchor there; now there are about a hundred great cotton factories, with over two million spindles. Since the railroad between Tokyo and the neighboring port of Yokohama was opened in 1872 several thousand miles of railways have been constructed, and the Japanese, who are very fond of travel, can go readily from one end to the other of their archipelago. Great towns have sprung up. Tokyo has over two million inhabitants, and the manufacturing city of Osaka more than a million. The total population of the islands is now about sixty

millions, more than one half that of the United States, but crowded into an area of about one hundred and sixty thousand square miles.

**797. The Japanese Constitution (1889).** With this progress came inevitably a demand for representative government, and as early as 1877 petitions for a constitution were laid before the emperor. Four years later he announced that a parliament would be established in 1890, and a commission was sent to Europe to study constitutional government there. In 1889 a constitution was completed which vested the powers of government in the Mikado and a parliament of two houses.

### III. WAR BETWEEN JAPAN AND CHINA AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR EUROPE

**798. Japan seeks an Outlet for her Products.** After carrying out the various reforms mentioned above, Japan found herself confronted, like the Western nations, with the necessity of extending her trade and securing foreign markets (§ 675). Her merchants and her ships became the rivals of the Europeans in the neighboring seas, where her commerce increased far more rapidly than that of the Western nations.

**799. The Chino-Japanese War (1894-1895).** On the opposite side of the Sea of Japan lies Korea, a land which has become well known throughout the world on account of the two bloody wars to which the question of its possession has given rise. For a long time China and Japan were rival claimants to the Korean kingdom. When Japanese trade developed, the question of control in Korea became an important one, and in 1894 it led to war between the two countries. But the Chinese, with their ancient weapons and organization, were no match for the Japanese, who had eagerly adopted every device of Western warfare, and in a short time the Chinese armies had been driven from Korea and the campaign was transferred to the neighboring Manchuria, where the Japanese took Port Arthur. China then called upon the Western powers for assistance, but they did not take action until Japan, in the

Treaty of Shimonoseki, had forced China's representative, Li Hung Chang, to recognize the complete independence of Korea (which practically meant opening it up to the Japanese) and to cede to Japan Port Arthur, the Liaotung peninsula on which it lies, and the island of Formosa.

**800. European Powers Intervene.** Russia, France, and Germany had watched the course of events with jealous eyes and now intervened to prevent Japan from securing a foothold on the mainland. Russia was the real leader in this intervention, for she coveted just the region which had been ceded to Japan and was eager to have the desirable harbor of Port Arthur. Japan was exhausted by the war with China and at that time had no adequate navy. Therefore the Mikado, at the demand of the three powers, withdrew from Manchuria.

**801. Russia's Policy in China.** The result of this compromise was to throw China into the arms of Russia, which proceeded to take every advantage of the situation. China had been forced to pay a heavy indemnity to Japan in order to get the Liaotung peninsula back again; and when the Chinese government attempted to borrow a large sum from England to meet this obligation, Russia interfered and herself loaned China eighty million dollars without security. In this way China became dependent upon her as a creditor. The Russians were permitted by the Chinese emperor to build their great Trans-Siberian railroad across his territory, which enabled them to reach Vladivostok by a direct line from Irkutsk. Moreover, in order to guard the railway line, Russian soldiers were to be introduced freely into Manchuria. It is clear that these arrangements gave Russia a great advantage over the other European powers, since she controlled the Chinese government through its debt and occupied Manchuria with her soldiers.

**802. The Germans seize Shantung.** Meanwhile the Germans who, as we have seen (§ 575), began to feel strong and ambitious enough to join in the scramble for colonies and protectorates, found an excuse for strengthening themselves in the same region. A German missionary having been murdered in the province of





FIG. 113. CHINESE COOLIES HAULING A BOAT

This method of pulling a boat up the rapids illustrates the old ways in China. The men each received a fourteenth of a cent in our money for their efforts. Now the rocks have been blown up by dynamite and steamboats have replaced the former craft





Shantung, which lies opposite Korea, a German squadron appeared in Kiaochow Bay in November, 1897, landed a force of marines, and raised the German flag. As a compensation for the murder of the missionary Germany demanded a long lease of Kiaochow, with the right to build railways in the region and work mines. Upon acquiring Kiaochow the Germans built harbors, constructed forts, military barracks, machine shops, etc. In short, a model German town was constructed on the Chinese coast, which, with its defenses, constituted a fine base for further extension of Germany's sphere of influence. At the close of the World War the Shantung peninsula, as we shall see, became a dangerous world issue.

**803. Russia leases Port Arthur.** At first the Tsar hoped to balk the plans of Germany, but decided instead to secure additional advantages for himself. Accordingly the Russian government arranged that Port Arthur and the waters adjacent to the Liaotung peninsula, upon which it lies, should be leased by China to Russia, in March, 1898, for a period of twenty-five years, subject to renewal by mutual consent. Port Arthur was to be open only to Chinese and Russian vessels, and Russia immediately began to build fortifications which were believed to render the town impregnable. A railway was constructed to Harbin, connecting Port Arthur with Vladivostok and the Trans-Siberian railway. This at last gave Russia a port on the Pacific which, unlike Vladivostok, was free from ice the year round and much better situated to enable Russia to meddle in Chinese affairs.

**804. Great Britain takes Part in carving up China.** Great Britain, learning of the negotiations, sent a fleet northward from Hongkong to the Gulf of Chihli (or Pechili) and induced China to lease to her Weihaiwei, which lay just between the lands acquired by Germany and Russia. England, moreover, believed it to be for her interest to be on good terms with Japan, and in 1902 an offensive and defensive alliance was concluded between the two powers, binding each to assist the other in case a third party joined in a conflict in which either was involved. For example, under the provisions, England had to aid Japan in a war with Russia should France or Germany intervene.

## IV. CHANGES IN CHINA; THE BOXER RISING

**805. Europeans long to exploit China.** The foreigners were by no means content with establishing trading posts in China; they longed to develop the neglected natural resources of the empire, to open up communication by railroads and steamships, and to Westernize the orientals, in order that business might be carried on more easily with them and new opportunities be found for profitable investments.

**806. Railroads, Steamships, and Telegraph introduced.** The first railroad in China was built by British promoters in 1876 from Shanghai to a point some fifteen miles to the north of that city. The Chinese, however, were horrified by this innovation, which they felt to be a desecration of the graves of their ancestors. Yielding to popular prejudice the government purchased the railroad, only to destroy it and throw the locomotives into the river. Nevertheless, five years later the Chinese themselves, with the aid of British capital, began the construction of an imperial railroad system, and in 1895 other foreigners besides the Russians were once more permitted to undertake the construction of railway lines, and there are now several thousand miles of road open for traffic. The French and Germans were also interested in opening up the regions within their spheres of influence, and the British were planning to push into the interior of China a line running northward from Rangoon through Mandalay. Thousands of miles of railway are now projected. The result will be to help unify the Chinese and develop a stronger nationality. Doubtless within half a century China will be covered with a network of lines which cannot fail to do much to revolutionize her ancient habits and civilization.

In 1898 the internal waterways of China were opened to foreign ships. Several lines of well-equipped steamships now ply on the Canton River and follow the waters of the Yangtze River for a thousand miles inland. Many thousand miles of telegraph lines are in operation, affording overland connection with Europe, while wireless stations have been planted even in the inland cities. The post office, organized in 1897, has branches throughout the country.

**807. China begins a Great Series of Reforms.** It was inevitable that intercourse with European nations should affect the whole policy and ideals of the Chinese government. In 1889 a decree was issued establishing an annual audience in which the emperor might show his "desire to treat with honor all the foreign ministers resident in Peking." A few years later the older humiliating ceremonies were abolished, and foreigners were received in a manner to recognize their equality with Chinese of the same rank.

In 1898 a series of decrees was issued with the object of reforming the army on models offered by those nations that had given so many proofs of their military superiority. New schools and colleges were planned with a view of starting the country on the road to progress. Chinese students were sent to Europe to study foreign methods of government, agricultural schools were built, patent and copyright laws were introduced, and a department of mines and railroads was established, in order that China might no longer be obliged to leave these matters entirely in the hands of foreigners. Newspaper editors were even encouraged to write on political questions.

**808. Conservatives resist Reforms.** These abrupt reforms aroused the superstitious horror of the conservative party. They found a sympathetic leader in the Dowager Empress, who succeeded in putting an end, for the time being, to the distasteful reforms. The Europeans, both missionaries and business men, nevertheless continued their activities, and the Chinese patriots believed it necessary, therefore, to organize a great movement to drive out the "foreign devils," who had been, in their eyes, steadily undermining the ancient traditions of China.

**809. The Boxer Uprising (1900).** Among those hostile to the foreigner none were more conspicuous than the secret society of the "Boxers," or, as they appear to have called themselves, the "Order of the Righteous Harmonious Fists." They were quite willing to coöperate with the Dowager Empress in carrying out her designs against foreign influence. They proclaimed that the Western nations were "lacerating China like tigers," and summoned every patriotic Chinaman to rise in defense of his country.



The party in favor of meeting the "Christian Peril" by violence rapidly increased. The Boxers, who were arming and drilling, knew very well that neither the Chinese officials nor the emperor's troops would interfere with them. Missionaries and traders were murdered in the provinces, and although the government at Peking always declared that it was doing all it could to suppress disorder, the representatives of foreign nations in the capital became thoroughly alarmed. On June 20, 1900, the Boxers, supported by the troops, killed the German ambassador, Baron von Ketteler, while on his way to the palace to expostulate with the government. The Europeans were then besieged but, for some reason which is not clear, the Chinese did not murder them all, as they might easily have done.

**810. The Powers intervene and settle Affairs in China.** The powers determined upon immediate intervention, and in August a relief expedition, made up of Japanese, Russian, British, American, French, and German troops, fought its way from Tientsin to Peking and brought relief to the imprisoned foreigners. The Chinese court left Peking, and the royal palace was shamefully desecrated and pillaged. Negotiations were now opened, and the aged Li Hung Chang rendered his last services by concluding an agreement in which China made certain reparations, including the payment of an indemnity of three hundred and twenty million dollars, and promised to repress all antiforeign societies. It will be observed that the European powers showed much ingenuity in finding excuses for bringing China under their control.

**811. The Renewal of Reforms.** Although the Dowager Empress still retained her power, the task of reform was again undertaken. The work of reorganizing the army was renewed, and students were again sent abroad in large numbers to investigate Western methods of industry and government. By one of the most momentous decrees in the intellectual history of the world the ancient classical system of education, which had for centuries been deemed an essential preparation for public office, was abolished in 1905. Students preparing for the government service were no longer examined upon Confucius and asked to write essays on

such subjects as "How the Moonlight sleeps on the Lake"; for the new examination questions dealt with the history of the West, with politics and economics, and with such grave questions as the relation of capital to labor and the methods of stimulating modern business. Even the Dowager Empress was obliged to yield to the progressive party, and in September, 1906, she went so far as to announce that China should prepare herself for the introduction of representative government and of a parliament.

## V. THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR; THE REVOLUTION IN CHINA

**812. Causes of the Conflict between Russia and Japan.** Scarcely had the troubles due to the Boxer rising been adjusted when a new war cloud appeared in the East. The interest of Japan in finding markets has already been mentioned. The occupation of Manchuria and Port Arthur by the Russians seriously threatened Japanese extension in that direction; and when Russia secured from Korea a lumber cession in the Yalu valley and sent Cossacks to build forts in that region, Japan, which regarded Korea as lying within her sphere of influence, could hardly fail to protest. Russia had agreed repeatedly to withdraw from Manchuria, but had always failed to keep her promises when the time came. She had, moreover, guaranteed the integrity of Korea, upon whose territory she was now encroaching. Accordingly, the Japanese, intent on keeping Korea for themselves, after spending some months in unsuccessful negotiations with the Tsar's government, broke off diplomatic relations on February 5, 1904, and began war against Russia.

**813. The Triumph of Japan.** Japan was well prepared for war and was, moreover, within easy reach of the field of conflict. The Russian government, on the contrary, was rotten to the core and was already engaged in a terrible struggle with the Russian nation (§§ 753-763). The eastern boundary of European Russia lay three thousand miles from Port Arthur and the Yalu River, and the only means of communication was the single line of badly constructed railroad that stretched across Siberia to the Pacific.

As a result of their superior equipment and training, the Japanese were everywhere victorious. They defeated the Russians in one terrific battle after another on land, besieged and captured the stronghold of Port Arthur, and at last, in May, 1905, practically annihilated the Tsar's fleet in the Sea of Japan.

**814. President Roosevelt and the Treaty of Peace (1905).** For reasons which are yet a matter of dispute President Roosevelt, acting under the provisions of the Hague Convention (§ 924 below), took measures which brought about a peace. After consulting the representatives of Japan and Russia at Washington and ascertaining the attitude of the neutral powers, he dispatched notes to the Tsar and the Mikado, urging them to open negotiations. This invitation was accepted, and on August 9 the first session of the conference was held at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. On September 5 the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed. This recognized the Japanese influence as supreme in Korea, which, however, was to remain independent.<sup>1</sup> Both the Japanese and Russians were to evacuate Manchuria; the Japanese were, however, given the rights in the Liaotung peninsula and Port Arthur which Russia had formerly enjoyed. Lastly, the southern part of the Russian island of Sakhalin was ceded to Japan.<sup>2</sup>

**815. China becomes a Republic.** Thus this great conflict produced by the rivalry of the powers in the East was brought to an end, but the wealth of China and the fact that it had not yet organized a strong army or navy left the way open for new encroachments by foreign governments. Nevertheless, China was changing almost as rapidly as Japan had. Students of Western countries, returning home, determined to overthrow the Manchu (or Manchurian) dynasty, which had ruled for two hundred and sixty-seven years. After a heroic and bloody struggle they were able to force the court, on

<sup>1</sup> The Japanese have not left Korea independent. They immediately took control of the administration, and in the summer of 1907 forced the Korean emperor most unwillingly to abdicate. Finally, by the treaty of August 23, 1910, Korea was annexed to the Japanese empire.

<sup>2</sup> Japan suffers greatly from overpopulation. She is eager to find new places for her surplus people to settle, but the influx of Japanese settlers into Australia, the United States, and Canada raised very serious problems. Finally all three countries decided to exclude Japanese immigrants.

February 12, 1912, to declare the abdication of the boy-emperor then on the throne and the creation of a republic.

**816. China's Troubles with its First President.** The president of the new republic, Yuan Shih-kai, posed as a revolutionist but really longed to be the successor of the old Manchu dynasty.

In the autumn of 1914 he ventured to announce that he would assume the title of "Emperor of China." The protest of Japan, and possibly of other powers, against this move led him to postpone carrying out his plan. Japan naturally feared that with a strong emperor China might defend itself successfully and even become a dangerous rival. Then the Republicans revolted, and Yuan Shih-kai finally, March, 1916, fearing to lose all, declared that he would never accept the title "emperor," and that the whole incident had been a mistake. This did not satisfy the Republicans, however,

who rose against a president who seemed to them to be steadily violating the principles of republican rule. During the spring of 1916 the disorders constantly increased and developed into a contest between southern China and the more backward North. In spite of the death of the president in June, 1916, the conflict continued.

The terrible war which was then engaging the whole attention of the European powers prevented them from interfering, and the Chinese were permitted to continue their experiments in attempting to turn their ancient and highly conservative monarchy into a real, modern republic. The difficulties are manifold and it will doubtless take a long time to overcome them (see below, § 1101).



FIG. 114. YUAN SHIH-KAI



## QUESTIONS

I. What were the relations between China and Europe prior to the nineteenth century? Show on a map the ports opened to Western commerce as a result of the Opium War of 1840 and the war waged by England and France against China in 1858.

II. Describe the relations of Japan with Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Give a brief account of the relations of the United States and Japan in 1853.

Why did Great Britain bombard certain of the Japanese ports in 1863-1864? Describe the revolution which took place in Japan after the accession of the Mikado Mutsuhito. What was the effect of the Industrial Revolution on the form of government of Japan?

III. What gave rise to the war between China and Japan in 1894-1895? Give the terms of the Treaty of Shimonoseki. What changes were made in this treaty as a result of the intervention of Russia, France, and Germany? What did Russia gain as a result of the compromise effected? In what way and when did Germany get possession of territory in the Shantung peninsula?

What compensation did Russia seek in 1898? What was the importance to Russia of this acquisition? How did Great Britain secure possession of Weihaiwei? What arrangement was made by Great Britain and Japan in 1902? Draw a map of the east coast of Asia and on it show the territory leased to foreigners by China.

IV. What led to the Boxer uprising? Describe the Peking insurrection and the intervention of the powers to restore order.

V. Describe the circumstances which led to the Russo-Japanese War. Outline the history of the war and give the terms of the Treaty of Portsmouth. Give a short account of the history of China since 1912.

## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) China and the opium traffic, pp. 419-422; (2) the rise of Japan as a world power, pp. 424-435; (3) the Boxer uprising and reform in China, pp. 435-444; (4) the Russo-Japanese War, pp. 444-447.

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the dismemberment and awakening of China, pp. 560-576; (2) the rise and growth of Japan, pp. 577-586; (3) Russian expansion in Asia, pp. 586-592; (4) European rivalry in the Far East, pp. 592-596. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (5) China, pp. 657-664; (6) Japan, pp. 664-671; (7) Russia and England in Asia, pp. 671-674.

## CHAPTER XXV

### EXPLORATION AND PARTITION OF AFRICA ; LATIN AMERICA

#### I. GRADUAL EXPLORATION OF AFRICA BY EUROPEANS

**817. Ancient Africa and the Mohammedan Conquest.** The vast continent of Africa, the northeastern corner of which was the seat of perhaps the first highly civilized people (the Egyptians), was the last of the great divisions of the earth's surface to be explored and appropriated by the European nations. The lower valley of the Nile and the coasts which bounded the Mediterranean on the south were well known to the ancients and were included in the Roman Empire, but the upper reaches of that great river and the main body of the continent to the south of the desert of Sahara were practically unknown to them, and they had no suspicions that the land extended for five thousand miles to the south of the Mediterranean.

**818. How the Mohammedans conquered Northern Africa.** Shortly after the death of Mohammed, in 632, his followers began the conquest of Egypt and northern Africa, and in less than a hundred years they had subdued all the region which had formerly been ruled from Rome. From Cape Guardafui, on the extreme east, to Cape Verde, lying on the Atlantic nearly five thousand miles to the west, they introduced their civilization and religion, so that to-day in the towns of Tunis and Morocco one sees many things to remind him of the conditions in Palestine or Arabia. The Mohammedans built up a flourishing trade with the interior; they traversed the deserts and opened caravan routes through the sandy wastes; they pushed their trading settlements down the east coast as far as a point opposite Madagascar; they made maps of that portion of the continent with which they had become familiar and described its climate and appearance. The knowledge which the

Mohammedans had acquired naturally spread into Spain, which long formed a part of their dominions, and it appears probable that the Portuguese, who began to explore the west coast of Africa in the fifteenth century, also received such information as they possessed from the Moors.

**819. Africa in the Age of World Exploration (1486-1815).** Europe was, however, a long time taking advantage of such knowledge of Africa as it secured through the Mohammedans. Although the Portuguese rounded the Cape of Good Hope in 1486, they found business in the East Indies too profitable to warrant their spending any time exploring and settling the uninviting interior of Africa. The most important trade which sprang up with that continent was the slave traffic, which was soon undertaken by the English, whose enterprising slavers made enormous fortunes at that cruel business. The Europeans generally were too busy settling the more attractive portions of the New World to undertake serious colonization in Africa. The Dutch post, established at the Cape of Good Hope in 1652, did not prove to be very successful, and the French station, St. Louis, founded at the mouth of the Senegal River, was nothing more than a trading station.

**820. The Situation in 1815.** No serious attempts had been made by any of the European powers to colonize any portion of Africa before the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1815. Indeed, the suppression of the slave trade (§ 362) had discouraged further activity for a time, for this traffic had been more profitable than the combined trade in gold, ivory, gum, and other African commodities.

The situation in 1815 may be summed up as follows: In northern Africa the Sultan of Turkey was the nominal suzerain of Egypt and the so-called Barbary States; that is, Tripoli, Tunis, and Algeria. Morocco was, however, an independent state, as it still is nominally, under the sultan of Morocco. France maintained her foothold at the mouth of the Senegal; the most important Portuguese possessions were in Lower Guinea and on the east coast opposite the island of Madagascar; the British held

some minor posts along the west coast and had wrested Cape Colony from the Dutch during the Napoleonic wars. The heart of Africa was still unknown; no European power contemplated laying claim to the arid waste of the Sahara Desert, and the more attractive regions of the Upper Nile were ruled by semicivilized Mohammedan chiefs.

For fifty years after the Congress of Vienna the advance of European powers in Africa was very slow indeed. England and France were, it is true, gradually extending their spheres of influence, and explorers were tracing the rivers and mountain chains of the interior. France, as has been explained, conquered Algiers during this period and formally annexed it in 1858. The Dutch Boers, disgusted with English rule, had migrated to the north and laid the foundations of the Transvaal and Orange River colonies (§§ 719-720).

**821. The Explorations of Livingstone and Stanley.** The latter half of the nineteenth century was, however, a time of active exploration in Africa. It is impossible here even to name all those adventurers who braved the torrid heat and fevers and the danger from savages and wild beasts. Under the auspices of the Royal Geographical Society of England a search was begun for the mysterious sources of the Nile, and a lake lying just south of the equator was discovered in 1858 and named Victoria Nyanza. In 1864 Sir Samuel Baker discovered another lake, Albert Nyanza, to the northwest, and explored its connections with the Nile River. Livingstone had visited Bechuanaland twenty years before and pushed up the valley of the Zambezi River, tracing it nearly to its source. In 1866 he explored the regions about the lakes of Nyasa and Tanganyika and reached a point on the upper Congo. This expedition attracted general attention throughout the civilized world. His long absence roused the fear that he was, perhaps, the prisoner of some savage tribe, and on his return to Lake Tanganyika he was met by Henry Stanley, another explorer, who had been sent out by the *New York Herald* to search for him. Livingstone, who was both missionary and explorer, continued his work until his death, in 1873.



**822. Stanley's Discoveries.** Two years later Stanley set out upon an expedition which is regarded as the most important in the annals of African exploration. After visiting lakes Victoria Nyanza and Tanganyika he journeyed across the country to the headwaters of the Congo, down which he found his way to the Atlantic. Meanwhile other explorers, French and German as well as English, were constantly adding to the knowledge of a hitherto unknown continent.

## II. PARTITION OF AFRICA

**823. The Partition of Africa.** Stanley's famous journey through the heart of "Darkest Africa" naturally aroused the intense interest of all the European powers, and within ten years after his triumphant return to Marseille in 1878 the entire surface of Africa had been divided up among the powers or marked out into "spheres of influence." A generation ago a map of Africa was for the most part indefinite and conjectural, except along the coast. To-day its natural features have been largely determined, and it is traversed by boundary lines almost as carefully drawn as those which separate the various European countries. The manner in which the English, French, and Germans asserted their claims in Africa has been briefly explained in preceding chapters.

**824. Review of the African Possessions of England, France, and Germany.** The English, as we have seen already, have built up a great federal dominion in South Africa, which is the most important of all the European colonies in Africa. They also hold valuable territories on the east coast, running inland to the great lakes.

The northwestern shoulder of the continent, from the mouth of the Congo to Tunis, belongs, with some exceptions, to France. It must be remembered, however, that a very considerable portion of the French claim is nothing but a desert, totally useless in its present state. On the east coast of Africa France controls French Somaliland, and her port of Jibuti, which lies at the mouth of the Red Sea, gives her somewhat the same advantages that Aden affords the English. The French also hold the island of Madagascar.

Between 1884 and 1890 Germany acquired four considerable areas of African territory, which included together nearly a million square miles—Togoland, Cameroons, German Southwest Africa, and German East Africa. The Germans made special efforts to develop these regions by building railways and schools and expending enormous sums in other ways, but the wars with the natives and the slight commerce which had been established left the experiment one of doubtful value.

**825. The Belgian Congo.** Wedged in between German East Africa and the French Congo lay the vast Belgian Congo, the history of which began with a conference held in Brussels in 1876 under the auspices of the king of Belgium. Representatives of most of the European countries were invited to attend, with a view to considering the best methods of opening up the region and of stopping the slave trade which was carried on by the Mohammedans in the interior. The result was the organization of an international African Association with its center at Brussels. The enterprise was, however, in reality the personal affair of King Leopold, who supplied from his own purse a large portion of the funds which were used by Stanley in exploring the Congo basin, establishing posts, and negotiating hundreds of treaties with the petty native chiefs.

The activity of the African Association aroused the apprehensions of the European powers interested in Africa, especially England and Portugal, and a congress was called at Berlin to consider the situation. This met in November, 1884, and every European state except Switzerland sent delegates, as did the United States. The congress recognized the right of the African Association to the vast expanse drained by the Congo River and declared the new territory a neutral state, the Congo Free State, open to the trade of all nations.

The following year King Leopold announced to the world that he had assumed sovereignty over the Congo Free State, and that he proposed to unite it in a personal union with Belgium. He gradually filled the government offices with Belgians and established customs lines with a view to raising revenue.

**826. Alleged Atrocities in the Belgian Congo.** During the opening years of the twentieth century the Belgians were charged with practicing atrocious cruelties on the natives. There is reason to think that the hideous reports published in the newspapers were much exaggerated, but there is little doubt that the natives, as commonly happens in such cases, have suffered seriously at the hands of the European invader. Labor was hard to secure, since the natives, accustomed to a free life in the jungle, did not relish driving spikes on railways or draining swamps for Belgian capitalists. The government, therefore, required native chiefs to furnish a certain number of workmen, and on their failure to supply the demand it had been customary to burn their villages. The government also required the natives to furnish a certain quantity of rubber each year; failure to comply with these demands had also brought summary punishment upon them. Finally protests in England and America led the Belgian ministry to take up the question of the Congo, and at length, in 1908, the government assumed complete ownership of the Free State, which then took the name of the Belgian Congo.

**827. The Minor Powers in Africa.** The Portuguese still control remnants of the possessions to which they laid claim when South Africa was first brought to the attention of Europe; namely, Guinea, Angola, and East Africa. Italy has the colony of Eritrea on the coast of the Red Sea, and Italian Somaliland to the south of Cape Guardafui, and in 1912 wrested Tripoli from Turkey by a costly war (§ 938 below). Spain's two colonies, one on the Strait of Gibraltar, the other on the Gulf of Guinea, only serve to remind her of the vast colonial empire which she has lost.

### III. QUESTION OF MOROCCO AND EGYPT

**828. Morocco.** Morocco still remains nominally independent of European powers, but has been an object of contention among them. Its population, which is a curious mixture of Berbers, Arabs, and negroes, has not materially changed its civilization during the past thousand years. The fierce tribesmen often defy

III

25

VI









the rule of their Sultan at Fez. A bandit leader, Raisuli, seized an English envoy to the Sultan, Sir Harry McLean, during the summer of 1907 and held him a prisoner for several months. This is but one of many instances which illustrate the inability of the Sultan of Morocco to control his subjects and protect foreigners.

**829. The Conference at Algeciras.** The French, who are neighbors of the Moors on the east, succeeded, in spite of many difficulties, in gradually developing relations with Morocco. They established trade in almonds, gum, and the famous Moroccan goatskin and also lent money to the Sultan. It will be recalled that after the settlement of the "Fashoda incident" (§ 615) Britain allowed France a free hand, so far as the British were concerned, in dealing with Morocco. The French soon found the pretext for intervention in Morocco, and were proceeding as though it were their own affair when Germany protested that it too had interests in Morocco. The result was a conference of the powers, including the United States, at Algeciras, Spain (just across the bay from Gibraltar), in 1906. Their representatives agreed on the formation of a police force under French and Spanish officers, and the organization of a state bank, which should be controlled by the powers. A continuance of disorder in Morocco enabled France to use the situation to extend her control, and this led to a second German protest; but this belongs rather to the history of Europe than of Africa, as it was one of the premonitions of the World War of 1914 (§ 932 below).

**830. Egypt under the Sultan of Turkey.** As for Egypt, this very ancient center of civilization had, it may be recalled, been conquered by the Arabs in the seventh century. Through the late Middle Ages it was ruled by a curious military class known as the Mamelukes and only fell to the Ottoman Turks in 1517. With the decline of the Sultan's power the country fell under the domination of Mameluke beys, or leaders, and it was against these that Bonaparte fought in 1798 (§ 275). Shortly after Nelson and the English had frustrated Bonaparte's attempt to bring Egypt under French rule a military adventurer from Albania, Mehemet



Ali, compelled the Sultan to recognize him as governor of Egypt in 1805. A few years later he brought about a massacre of the Mamelukes and began a series of reforms. He created an army and a fleet and not only brought all Egypt under his sway but established himself at Khartum where he could control the Sudan,<sup>1</sup> or region of the Upper Nile. Before his death, in 1849, he had induced the Sultan to recognize his heirs as rightful rulers, Khedives, of Egypt.

**831. French and English Intervention.** The importance of Egypt for the Western powers was greatly increased by the construction of the Suez Canal, begun in 1859 (§ 677), for both Port Said on the Mediterranean and Suez on the Red Sea are Egyptian ports. The English were able to get a foothold in Egypt through the improvidence of the Egyptian ruler Ismail I, who came to the throne in 1863 and by reckless extravagance involved his country in a heavy debt which forced him to sell a block of his canal shares to the British government at a low price. Still heavily in debt, however, Ismail was forced by his English and French creditors to let them oversee his financial administration. This foreign intervention aroused discontent in Egypt, and the natives revolted in 1882, demanding "Egypt for the Egyptians."

**832. The English Protectorate.** Inasmuch as France declined to join in suppressing the rebellion, England undertook it alone, and after putting down the uprising assumed a temporary occupation of the country and the supervision of the army and finances of Egypt. The British continued their "temporary" occupation until shortly after the opening of the World War of 1914, when they assumed a permanent protectorate over Egypt, which was declared independent of Turkey.<sup>2</sup>

**833. The Mahdi and the Death of Gordon.** Shortly after the British conquest of Egypt a revolt arose in the Sudan under the leadership of Mohammed Ahmed, who claimed to be the

<sup>1</sup> The term "Sudan" (see map) was applied by the Mohammedans to the whole region south of the Sahara Desert, but as now used it commonly means Anglo-Egyptian Sudan only.

<sup>2</sup> The Khedive, remaining loyal to the Turks, was dethroned, the title abolished, and a new ruler acclaimed as Sultan.

Messiah and found great numbers of fanatical followers who called him El Mahdi, "the leader." General Gordon was in charge of the British garrison at Khartum. Here he was besieged by the followers of the Mahdi in 1885 and after a memorable defense fell a victim to their fury, thus adding a tragic page to the military history of the British Empire. This disaster was avenged twelve




FIG. 115. GORDON COLLEGE, KHARTUM

This college, named for their murdered general, was erected by the British to teach the sons of their former enemies the arts of civilization. On the campus is a mosque, for the British do not interfere with the religion of these Sudanese tribesmen

years later when in 1897-1898 the Sudan was reconquered and the city of Khartum was taken by the British under General Kitchener.

The occupation of Egypt by the British was followed by unquestioned progress of the country; industry and commerce grew steadily, public works were constructed, and financial order was reestablished under the supervision of the British agent, whose word was law. A large dam was built across the Nile at Aswan to control the floods and also to increase greatly the fertility of the valley. Still the Egyptians were restless under British dominion. Their feeling of national independence grew stronger with the passing years and sometimes took the form of acts of violence. Thus there was created a problem for the British government similar to that existing in India and Ireland (§ 1042 below).

#### IV. DECLINE OF THE SPANISH EMPIRE AND RISE OF THE UNITED STATES AS A WORLD POWER

**834. American Expansion.** In striking contrast to the colonial expansion of the other powers of Europe stand the two countries which in the era of discovery led them all in enterprise and achievement—Spain and Portugal.<sup>1</sup> Spain, that once could boast that the sun never set on her empire, had been in decline since the days of Philip II. After losing her colonies on the American continents in the early nineteenth century (§§ 408–409), she made no compensating gains in the other parts of the world.

In the meantime there was rising to predominance in North America a nation that was destined to deal the final blow to the Spanish empire. In the universal search for trade American business men were in no respect behind their European competitors. The natural resources of the United States and the skill of the American people placed that country among the first commercial powers of the whole world. At the same time the American territorial possessions were increased in the Atlantic and the Pacific. In 1867 Alaska was purchased from Russia. In 1878 a coaling station was secured in the Samoan Islands, and twelve years later one of the islands was formally brought under our flag. In 1898 the Hawaiian Islands were annexed. In that same year came the clash between the United States and Spain, which put an end to Spanish dominion in the New World.

**835. The Spanish-American War (1898).** The cause of this war was the chronic disturbance which existed in Cuba under Spanish government and which led the United States to decide upon the expulsion of Spain from the Western Hemisphere. In 1895 the last of many Cuban insurrections against Spain broke out, and sympathy was immediately manifested in the United States. Both political parties during the presidential campaign of 1896 declared in favor of the Cubans, and with the inauguration

<sup>1</sup> Portugal, which lost its greatest possession, Brazil, about the same time that Spain lost its South American colonies, still retains considerable stretches of Africa, as a glance at the map will show, but its holdings in Asia are reduced to the posts of Macao in China, Goa in India, and two small islands. In foreign affairs it has been closely allied with England.

of McKinley a policy of intervention was adopted. The American government demanded the recall of General Weyler—whose cruelty had become notorious—and a reform in the treatment of prisoners of war. In February, 1898, the battleship *Maine* was mysteriously blown up in the harbor of Habana, where it had been sent in American interests. Although the cause of this disaster could not be discovered, the United States, maintaining that the conditions in Cuba were intolerable, declared war on Spain in April.

The war was brief, for the American forces were everywhere victorious. Cuba and Porto Rico were lost to Spain, and by the capture of the city of Manila in May the Philippine Islands also fell to the United States. Peace was reëstablished in August, and representatives were shortly sent to Paris to arrange the final terms. Cuba was declared independent; Porto Rico, with the adjoining islands of Vieques and Culebra, and the Philippines were ceded to the United States.<sup>1</sup> The following year the Caroline and Pelew islands were transferred to Germany, and thus the territory of Spain was reduced to the Spanish peninsula, the Balearic and Canary islands, and her small holdings in Africa.

**836. Latin-American Relations of the United States.** Many forces conspired to extend the influence of the United States into Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean. In general the Latin-American republics were formed from an amalgamation of native and European races, both inexperienced in the art of self-government. They were rich in natural resources but backward in industries. They needed capital to develop their business and foreign enterprise to start their factories and railways. They were plagued by many revolutions that disturbed the course of civil progress and resulted in the destruction of life and property. As they were near neighbors, the United States could not avoid taking an interest in their affairs. A Pan-American Congress composed of delegates from nineteen countries of Latin America first met in Washington in 1889 to discuss mutual interests.

<sup>1</sup> Spain also ceded to the United States the island of Guam in the Ladrone archipelago.



A bureau of American republics—later called the Pan-American Union—was founded in Washington and a handsome building erected to house it.

An old dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela over the boundary line of British Guiana roused the interest of the United States, and it offered to arbitrate. This offer was rejected



FIG. 116. PAN-AMERICAN UNION IN WASHINGTON

by the British prime minister, Lord Salisbury, who declared that the matter did not concern the United States. President Cleveland determined, however, to maintain the Monroe Doctrine (§ 416) and urged Congress, December, 1895, to take the decision in hand, even at the risk of war with England. Parliament, horrified by the idea of a war between the two great English-speaking peoples, rebuked Lord Salisbury's policy and proposed that the matter be settled by arbitration, which was done.

The annexation of Porto Rico in 1898, the purchase of the Panama Canal strip in 1904 and the construction of the Canal, and the acquisition of the Virgin Islands from Denmark in 1917 were examples of the extension of control on the part of the United States. During President Wilson's administrations Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua became American protectorates,

at least for an indefinite period. The extension of American control over the last-named republics grew out of what was called "dollar diplomacy"; namely, intervention by the United States to assure the payment of debts due to foreign creditors.

**837. The Mexican Question.** In the same way financial considerations as well as local disorders involved the United States in Mexican affairs. After the overthrow of President Diaz, in 1917, the Mexican republic fell into a revolutionary state. One military ruler after another rose to power only to be overthrown. American lives and property were destroyed in the turmoil. Americans who had invested in Mexican mines, oil wells, and other enterprises were threatened with the loss of their money; and occasional raids were made over the border into our territory. Two or three times the United States and Mexico were on the verge of war. In 1914 President Wilson landed American marines at Vera Cruz, but a general armed conflict was averted by the friendly mediation of Argentine, Brazil, and Chile—the "A B C powers," as they were called. Again, in 1916, a raid by a Mexican bandit, Villa, into New Mexico led to an expedition under General Pershing to capture the offender, but the troops were withdrawn within a few months.

Just after the World War was closed by the Treaty of Versailles Mexican affairs took a new turn with the murder of the president, Carranza, and the rise of another leader to power, General Obregon, in 1920. For a time the United States refused to recognize the new Mexican government, but in 1923 it sent a commission to Mexico City, which reached an agreement on most of the problems that troubled the two countries. In the settlement the United States recognized the new order in Mexico, and in 1924 a new president, Calles, was installed by the peaceful process of election—the first in many decades. Although this was promising, it was not long before the old dispute over property claimed by American citizens in Mexico flared up again. In January, 1927, President Coolidge sent a sharp note to Congress, declaring that the United States could not allow the Mexican government to seize the property of its citizens and hinted that some strong measures would be taken. The Senate replied, however, by urging arbitration between the two countries.

## QUESTIONS

I. Outline the history of Africa to 1815. Describe the situation in Africa in the year 1815. What progress in the opening up of Africa during the first half of the nineteenth century was made by France and England? Indicate on a map the parts of Africa explored by Livingstone and Stanley.

II. Review the chief possessions of England, France, and Germany in Africa before the World War. Describe the development of the Belgian Congo and discuss the problems involved.

III. What has England had to do with the French occupation of Morocco? Briefly sketch the history of Egypt to the middle of the nineteenth century. In what way did Great Britain gain a foothold in Egypt?

What was the position of Great Britain in Egypt from 1882 to 1914? Describe the revolt in the Sudan in 1885. What have been the results of the British occupation of Egypt?

IV. Review the story of Spain in the nineteenth century. How did it lose its colonies? What colonial possessions has Portugal? Outline the territorial expansion of the United States. What were the important acquisitions of the United States in the Caribbean region? Define "dollar diplomacy." Contrast the civilization of South America with that of the United States. Discuss the Mexican question.

## REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) Stanley in Africa, pp. 448-452; (2) the Congo question, pp. 453-454; (3) England in Egypt, pp. 454-458.

**Supplementary.** Consult encyclopedia articles under the following headings: Mohammedanism, Africa, Livingstone, H. M. Stanley, Congo, Morocco, Algeciras, General Gordon, Lord Salisbury, Philippines, and Panama Canal.

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the partition of Africa, pp. 614-637; (2) the decline of Spain and Portugal, pp. 378-389. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (3) the exploration and partition of Africa, pp. 675-682.

# *BOOK VII. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY AND THE WORLD WAR*

## CHAPTER XXVI

### EUROPE IN THE OPENING YEARS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

#### I. REVIEW OF THE PREVIOUS CHAPTERS

**838. The Transformation of Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.** In the preceding chapters we have tried to bridge the gap which separates the Europe of Louis XIV from the world of to-day. We have seen how in the eighteenth century the European monarchs light-heartedly made war upon one another in the hope of adding a bit of territory to their realms or of seating a relative or a friend on a vacant throne. Such enterprises were encouraged by the division of Germany and Italy into small states which could be used as counters in this royal game of war and diplomacy. But nevertheless in the eighteenth century European history was already broadening out. The whole eastern half of the continent was brought into relation with the West by Peter the Great and Catherine, and merchants and traders were forcing the problem of colonial expansion upon their several governments. Great Britain succeeded in driving France from India and America and in laying the foundation of that empire, unprecedented in extent, over which she presides to-day. Portugal and the Netherlands, once so conspicuous upon the seas, had lost their importance, and the grasp of Spain upon the New World was relaxing.

**839. Problems of Reform in the Eighteenth Century.** We next considered the condition of the people over whom the monarchs of the eighteenth century reigned—the serfs, the



townspeople with their guilds, the nobility, the clergy, and the religious orders. We noted the unlimited authority of the kings and the extraordinary prerogatives and privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic clergy. The position of the Anglican Church and of the many Protestant sects in England was explained.

We next showed how the growing interest in natural science served to wean men from their reverence for the past and to open up vistas of progress; how the French philosophers, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, and many others, attacked existing institutions, and how the so-called enlightened despots who listened to them undertook a few timid reforms, mainly with a view of increasing their own power. But when at last, in 1789, the king of France was forced to call together representatives of his people to help him fill an empty treasury, they seized the opportunity to limit his powers, abolish the old evils, and proclaim a program of reform which was destined to be accepted in turn by all the European nations.

**840. The Work of Napoleon.** The wars which began in 1792 led to the establishment of a temporary republic in France, but a military genius, the like of which the world had never before seen, soon brought not only France but a great part of western Europe under his control. He found it to his interest to introduce many of the reforms of the French Revolution in the countries which he conquered, and by his partial consolidation of Germany and the consequent extinction of the Holy Roman Empire he prepared the way for the creation later of one of the most powerful European states of recent times.

**841. Rise of Democratic Government.** Between the Congress of Vienna, which readjusted the map of Europe after Napoleon's downfall, and the end of the nineteenth century a number of very important changes occurred. Both Germany and Italy were consolidated and took their places among the great powers. The Turk was steadily pushed back, and a group of states unknown in the eighteenth century came into existence in the Balkan peninsula. Everywhere the monarchs lost their former absolute powers and more or less gracefully submitted to the

limitations imposed by constitutions. Even the Tsar, while still calling himself "Autocrat of all the Russias," had promised to submit new laws and the provisions of his yearly budget to a parliament.

**842. Imperialism, Industrialism, and Modern Problems.** Alongside these important changes an industrial revolution was in progress, the influence of which upon the lives of the people at large has been incalculably greater than all that armies and legislative assemblies have accomplished. It not only gave rise to the most serious problems which face Europe to-day but heralded an imperialism which carried European civilization through all the world. During the latter half of the nineteenth century the European powers, especially England, France, Germany, and Russia, were busy opening up the vast Chinese Empire and other Asiatic countries to European influences, and in this way the whole continent of Asia was, in a certain sense, drawn into the current of European history. Africa, the borders alone of which were known in 1850, was explored and apportioned out among the European powers. These are perhaps the most striking features of our study of the past two hundred years.

It remains for us to see what Europe itself was like in the opening years of the twentieth century, to examine how it took over the heritage of the past, with its achievements and its weaknesses and many evils, and what further reforms and readjustments were forced upon those guiding the nations' policies.

## II. WAR ON POVERTY IN ENGLAND, 1906-1914

**843. England long Conservative.** At the close of the nineteenth century England was, to all appearances, as conservative as any nation in western Europe. The enthusiasm for the extension of the suffrage and for the reform of ancient evils, which had stirred the country for a hundred years, seemed to have died away. Contentment with the existing order and interest in great "imperialistic" enterprises in South Africa and other parts of the world characterized English politics. During the twenty years

from 1886 to 1906 (except for a short period in 1892-1895) the Conservative, or *Unionist*, party<sup>1</sup> was in control of the House of Commons and the government. Liberalism appeared to be dead, and the agitation of the Socialists apparently made little impression on the workingmen.

**844. The Political Upheaval of 1906; the Socialists.** But the general election of 1906 brought a startling change. The Unionists were completely defeated by the Liberals, and no less than fifty labor representatives were elected to Parliament. Several of these were avowed Socialists. Socialism made very little progress in Britain during the nineteenth century. In 1883 a Social Democratic Federation had been formed to promote the teachings of Marx, but it had little success. The Independent Labor party appeared in 1893 under the leadership of Keir Hardie, a miner who was elected to Parliament. It was moderately socialistic and grew slowly. The Fabian Society, of which Sidney and Beatrice Webb, G. B. Shaw, Graham Wallas, and H. G. Wells have been members, believed in reaching the Socialists' goal by going slowly (like the old Roman general Fabius, who gained his end by going slowly (Vol. I, § 331)). So it has advocated municipal or national ownership of land and industrial capital. But the Fabians do not form a political party. It was not until the trade-unions entered politics in 1905, cooperating with the Independent Labor party, that much was accomplished toward making the labor leaders a strong influence in determining the policy of the government. In the next ten years the Liberals, with their radical and "laborite" colleagues, made such sweeping reforms as amounted to a real revolution in British society and politics.

**845. Views of a Liberal Leader.** The change in English sentiment was clearly expressed by a Liberal, Mr. Winston Churchill, in a political speech at Nottingham, on January 30, 1909: "The main aspirations of the British people are at the present time

<sup>1</sup> When Gladstone introduced his Home Rule Bill for Ireland in 1886 (§ 673) the Conservative party was reënforced by those Liberals who did not approve of the bill, and the name "Unionist" came to be applied to the group which had formerly been called "Conservative."

social rather than political. They see around them on every side, and almost every day, spectacles of confusion and misery which they cannot reconcile with any conception of humanity or justice. They see that there are in the modern state a score of misfortunes that can happen to a man without his being at fault in any way. They see, on the other hand, the mighty power of science, backed by wealth and power, to introduce order, to provide safeguards, to prevent accidents, or at least mitigate their consequences. They know that this country is the richest in the world; and in my sincere judgment the British democracy will not give their hearts to any party that is not able and willing to set up that larger, fuller, more elaborate, more thorough social organization without which our country and its people will inevitably sink through sorrow to disaster and our name and fame fade upon the pages of history."

**846. New Labor Laws.** In this spirit the Liberal government advocated, shortly after its accession to power in 1906, a series of laws designed to diminish, at least, if not to abolish, the evils of poverty, "sweating," unemployment, and industrial accidents. The provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897 were extended to agricultural laborers and domestic servants. Under this law employers in the industries included are required to pay compensation to workmen injured in their employ, except when the accident is due to the "serious and willful misconduct of the injured workman himself." At the same time (1906) a law was passed exempting the funds of trade-unions from the liability of being seized for damages caused by their officials in strikes and industrial conflicts generally. Two years later (1908) Parliament passed an act providing that "a workman shall not be below ground in a mine, for the purpose of his work and of going to and from his work, for more than eight hours during any consecutive twenty-four hours."

**847. The Problem of Poverty.** Measures for the benefit of trade-unionists, miners, and injured workmen, however important they may be, did not solve the problem of poverty, due to low wages, uncertain employment, illness, and causes other than those



which are due to individual carelessness. Undoubtedly poverty on a large scale was one of the inevitable accompaniments of the Industrial Revolution, and in England the amount of depressing poverty was only too apparent. A number of years ago Mr. Charles Booth, a wealthy shipowner, feeling that there was no accurate information available in regard to the condition of the working people of London, undertook a house-to-house canvass at his own expense. With a large group of helpers he set about ascertaining the "numerical relations which poverty, misery, and depravity bear to regular earnings and comparative comfort" and published, as the result of his survey, *The Life and Labor of the People of London*, in sixteen volumes. In the district of East London, embracing a population of nearly a million, he found that more than one third of the people belonged to families with incomes of a guinea (about \$5.15) or less a week; that 42 per cent of the families earned from about \$5.50 to \$7.50 a week; and that only about 13 per cent had more than \$7.50 a week to live on. His studies further revealed terrible overcrowding in squalid tenements which were badly lighted, poorly equipped with water and sanitary arrangements, and conducive to disease. He reached the startling conclusion that throughout the vast city of London nearly one third of the people were in poverty; that is, lived on wages too low to provide the necessaries for a decent physical existence, to say nothing of comforts or luxuries.

It might at first sight seem that the poverty of London is exceptionally great, but Mr. Rowntree, in an equally careful survey, proved that in the city of York, with its population of less than eighty thousand inhabitants, toward one third of the people are also, as in London, in dire poverty. He showed, too, that the physical development of the children, the prevalence of disease, and the death rate corresponded with the rate of wages; in short, that health, happiness, and well-being increased as wages increased. There is reason to believe that conditions are essentially the same in many other modern cities, not only in England but throughout the world, although this has not as yet been proved by scientific investigations.

**848. How the English Government declared War on Poverty.** Formerly it was generally assumed that poverty was inevitable and that little could be done to remedy it, since there was not enough wealth in any given community to make everybody comfortable; but the progress of practical inventions and of scientific discovery (see next chapter) has roused the hope in the minds of many that if industries were reorganized in a way to avoid waste and to promote efficiency, if the idle were set to work and precautions taken to distribute the wealth in such a way that a few could not appropriate vast fortunes, there might sometime be enough, so that all could live in comfort and bring up their children in healthful surroundings, thus greatly reducing vice and disease. As the kindly Pope Leo XIII well said, "There can be no question that some remedy must be found, and that quickly, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on a large majority of the very poor."

The English government boldly grappled with the situation and proceeded to "make war on poverty" a part of its official program. In 1908 it passed an old-age pension law, the leading provisions of which were that the recipient of a government pension must be seventy years of age, and have an annual income of less than \$150 (£31 10s.). Criminals and those who had not honestly worked for their self-support were excluded. The maximum pension allowed was, however, only about \$1.25 per week.

**849. Government Employment Bureaus.** To help in reducing the large amount of unemployment, Parliament passed an act in 1909 authorizing the establishment of labor exchanges throughout the country to collect information as to employers requiring working people and as to laborers seeking employment. Provisions were also made whereby the government might advance loans to laborers to pay their traveling expenses to the places where employment might be found for them by the labor exchanges.

**850. Regulation of Wages in "Sweated" Trades.** Parliament has sought to raise the level of wages in some industries which do not pay the employees enough to uphold a fairly decent standard of life. By an act passed in 1909 provision was made

for the establishment of trade boards in certain of the "sweated" trades, such as tailoring, machine lace-making, and box-making industries, or any other trade which may fall below decent standards of wages or conditions of labor. These trade boards consisted of representatives of the working people and of the employers and also persons appointed by the government, and were empowered to fix minimum rates of wages for time-work and general minimum rates for piece-work in their respective trades. Agreements to pay or accept wages at a lower rate than those fixed by the board were forbidden, and employers paying less than the minimum wages were liable to heavy fines.

**851. The House of Lords blocks Reform.** Meanwhile the opposition to these sweeping reforms was becoming intense among the Conservatives. As they were in a minority in the House of Commons, however, they were unable to do more than to protest that the country was going to ruin and that the upper and middle classes would be submerged by the rising power of the people. Although the Conservatives had only a minority in the Commons, they were firmly intrenched in the House of Lords, where they had a large majority, and there they began to take up arms against measures which were, in their opinion, nothing short of revolutionary. In December, 1906, the Lords mutilated a bill which the Commons had passed for the support of a system of national, free, nonreligious schools,—like those of America,—and a few days later they threw out a bill abolishing the ancient practice of allowing a man to vote in all counties in which he had the requisite property to entitle him to the ballot.

**852. The Famous Budget of 1909.** The real clash between the Lords and the Commons came in 1909 over the budget; that is, over the taxes which the Liberals proposed to lay and the expenses they proposed to incur. In April of that year Mr. Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer in Mr. Asquith's cabinet, laid before the House of Commons a scheme of taxation which stirred up a veritable hornets' nest. In this "revolutionary budget" he proposed a high tax on automobiles, a heavy income tax with a special additional tax on incomes over £5000,—heavier on *unearned* than





GREAT TANGLEY MANOR IN SURREY, BUILT IN ELIZABETH'S TIME

Such houses of the English nobility often lay in great parks which Lloyd George felt should be turned over to agriculture





on *earned* incomes,—and an inheritance tax on a new scale, varying according to the amount of the inheritance up to 15 per cent of estates over £1,000,000. He also proposed a new land tax, distinguishing sharply between landowners who actually worked their lands and the owners of coal and iron lands and city lots who received mining royalties or made large profits from growth in land values. The budget also included a 20 per cent tax on unearned values in land, payable on its sale or transfer, so that anyone who sold property at a profit would have to pay a good share of the gain to the public treasury. The chancellor also proposed a special tax on undeveloped and mineral lands.

**853. A Budget for War on Poverty.** These special taxes, in addition to the other taxes, made a heavy budget; but the chancellor defended it on the ground that it was a war budget for “waging implacable war against poverty.” He concluded his opening speech in defense of his plans by expressing the hope “that great advance will be made during this generation toward the time when poverty with its wretchedness and squalor will be as remote from the people of this country as the wolves which once infested the forests.”

**854. The Dispute over Earned and Unearned Incomes.** The budget was at once hotly attacked by the Conservatives as socialistic and revolutionary. They claimed that the distinction between “earned” and “unearned” incomes was an unwarranted and unjust attack on the rights of property. “If a man,” asked one objector, “is to be more heavily taxed on an income that he has not earned than on an earned income, on the ground that he does not have the same absolute right to both incomes, why may not the government advance step by step until it takes away all unearned incomes on the theory that their possessors have no right to them at all?” Some of the more timid defenders of the budget shrank from answering this question and contented themselves by replying that it was a matter of degree, not of fundamental principles. Other supporters of the budget frankly declared that a man’s right to his property depended upon the way in which he got it.

Speaking on this point, Mr. Winston Churchill said: "Formerly the question of the taxgatherer was, 'How much have you got?'. . . Now a new question has arisen. We do not only ask to-day, 'How much have you got?' we also ask, 'How did you get it? Did you earn it by yourself, or has it been left to you by others? Was it gained by processes which are in themselves beneficial to the community in general, or was it gained by processes which have done no good to anyone, but only harm? Was it gained by the enterprise and capacity necessary to found a business or merely by squeezing and bleeding the owner and founder of the business? Was it gained by supplying the capital which industry needs, or by denying, except at extortionate price, the land which industry requires? Was it derived by active reproductive processes, or merely by squatting on some piece of necessary land till enterprise and labor, national interests and municipal interests, had to buy you out at fifty times the agricultural value? Was it gained by opening new minerals to the



FIG. 117. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

The son of a Welsh school-teacher, Mr. Lloyd George knew himself the meaning of that poverty he has tried to lessen in Britain. Studying law, he entered politics and was elected to Parliament at the age of twenty-seven. He bitterly opposed the Boer War and was noted as a fearless radical, as well as the leader of Welsh nationalism. Becoming a cabinet minister when the Liberals came to power in 1905, he continued his attacks on "property" but combined with them much far-seeing statesmanship. It was mainly due to him that England went so far in the "war against poverty." When the great war of 1914 came Lloyd George's energy and skill did much to awaken England to her danger and to prepare to meet it

got?'. . . Now a new question has arisen. We do not only ask to-day, 'How much have you got?' we also ask, 'How did you get it? Did you earn it by yourself, or has it been left to you by others? Was it gained by processes which are in themselves beneficial to the community in general, or was it gained by processes which have done no good to anyone, but only harm? Was it gained by the enterprise and capacity necessary to found a business or merely by squeezing and bleeding the owner and founder of the business? Was it gained by supplying the capital which industry needs, or by denying, except at extortionate price, the land which industry requires? Was it derived by active reproductive processes, or merely by squatting on some piece of necessary land till enterprise and labor, national interests and

municipal interests, had to buy you out at fifty times the agricultural value? Was it gained by opening new minerals to the

service of man, or by drawing a mining royalty from the toil and adventure of others? . . . How did you get it?' That is the new question which has been postulated [proposed] and which is vibrating in penetrating repetition through the land."

### III. CURBING OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS; SUFFRAGE; THE IRISH QUESTION

**855. The Contest between the Commons and the Lords.** The arguments in favor of the budget convinced the House of Commons, and it was carried by a handsome majority. In the House of Lords, however, it was defeated by a vote of 350 to 75.

The Liberals immediately took up the gage thus thrown down. On December 2 Mr. Asquith (who had become prime minister in 1908) moved in the House of Commons a resolution "That the action of the House of Lords in refusing to pass into law the financial provision made by the House for the services [that is, expenses] of the year is a breach of the Constitution and a usurpation of the rights of the House of Commons."

**856. Two Appeals to the Country (1910).** An appeal was then made to the country, and a new House of Commons was elected. The Liberal party found its numbers greatly reduced, but enjoyed the support of the Socialist, Radical, and Irish groups in the endeavors to reduce the ancient powers of the House of Lords. Only when Asquith warned the Lords that unless they passed the proposed budget there would be another appeal to the country, did they yield, in April, 1910. But the general question of the powers of the upper house was not settled by this victory, and the war on the Lords' old right to reject measures passed by the Commons continued to be carried on in and out of Parliament. The death of King Edward VII (May, 1910) caused a slight truce, but the struggle was renewed in the succeeding autumn, and a new election took place in which the Liberals made slight gains.

**857. The House of Lords Subdued.** Shortly after the opening of the new Parliament in 1911 a bill designed to check the exercise of the "veto" power by the Lords was introduced in the



Commons and passed by a good round majority. The measure was then sent to the House of Lords, and Mr. Asquith announced that he had received the consent of the new king, George V, to create enough new peers to insure its passage in case its Conservative opponents were able to defeat it. Thus intimidated, the upper house, on August 18, 1911, passed the Parliament Act, or the Lords' Veto Bill, as it was called, the leading provisions of which follow.

**858. The Lords' Veto Bill.** If any money bill—that is, a bill relative to raising taxes and making appropriations—is passed by the House of Commons and sent up to the Lords at least one month before the end of a session, and is not passed by the Lords within one month without amendment, the bill may be presented to the king for his signature and on being approved becomes a law, notwithstanding the fact that the Lords have not consented to it. Any other public bill passed by the House of Commons at three successive sessions and rejected by the Lords at each of the three sessions may likewise be presented to the king, and on receiving his approval will become a law without the consent of the Lords.<sup>1</sup> The veto bill also fixed *five* years instead of *seven* years as the time which any parliament may last. That is, under the law of August 18, 1911, a new parliamentary election must be held at least every five years, although a dissolution may, of course, be ordered at any time by the cabinet.<sup>2</sup>

**859. A New System of Labor Insurance.** With the House of Lords curbed, the Liberal government proceeded with further reforms. The National Insurance Act went into effect in July, 1912. One part of this law requires the compulsory insurance of nearly all employees (except those not engaged in manual labor and enjoying an income of more than £160 a year) against *ill health* of every kind. The insured persons, the employers, and the government are all contributors to the fund. Among the benefits for the insured are medical treatment and attendance,

<sup>1</sup> The bill must not, however, be rushed through, but must have been under consideration for at least two years.

<sup>2</sup> Provision was at last made in 1911 to pay members of the House of Commons £400 a year.

hospital treatment for tuberculosis, payments during sickness, aid to the disabled, and the payment of 30s. to each mother on the birth of a child. A second portion of the act requires employers and employees in certain trades to contribute a small sum weekly to a fund for insurance against *unemployment* and provides government assistance as well.<sup>1</sup>

**860. Municipal Reforms.** Along with these measures of Parliament for the nation as a whole, a movement went on for local betterment. In recent years there has been a great increase in municipal enterprise and ownership of public utilities. Cities like Manchester and Birmingham, as well as London, have undertaken great public works. Most of them own their street railways, as well as gas and electric-light plants, and experiments in the development of model suburbs or workmen's houses.

**861. Lloyd George Prime Minister, 1916.** When the war came, in 1914, Asquith, as prime minister, failed to satisfy the people that he was able to cope with the terrible situation. Lloyd George became more and more prominent in the direction of affairs, and finally, in December, 1916, there was a reorganization of the government, by which he became prime minister; various well-known statesmen from both the Liberal and the Unionist party were selected to aid him in a coalition cabinet.

**862. Extension of "Woman's Suffrage."** In the spring of 1917 the cabinet took up the old question of extending the right to vote and introduced a "Representation of the People" bill, which proposed not only to permit men over twenty-one years of age to vote but to grant the right to vote to millions of women.

Among the great changes of the last quarter of a century has been the growing tendency to extend the right of voting to women as well as men. In 1893 women were enfranchised in New Zealand and a year later in South Australia. Shortly after the establishment

<sup>1</sup> Among the reforms which Lloyd George was known to advocate was a very heavy tax on land, arranged to hit the great English landowners, mainly the nobles. He thought that in this way he might bring under cultivation thousands of acres which, while as private parks they have formed a delightful feature of England, have been subtracted from the farming land so essential to give the country sufficient food. The heavy taxes imposed during the World War have done a good deal to discourage the holding of vast uncultivated estates.

of the new Commonwealth of Australia in 1901 the right to vote for members of Parliament was granted to women. In 1906 the women of Finland, and in 1907 and 1912 the women of Norway and Sweden respectively, were given the vote on the same terms as men. Denmark followed their example in 1915. As a result of the World War of 1914 the right of women to vote was proclaimed in Germany, Russia, and the various new states formed from Austria-Hungary. In 1920 the United States ratified an amendment to the Federal constitution extending the suffrage to women.

**863. The Militant-Suffragist Movement in England.** In England a new and striking interest was given to the whole subject of woman's suffrage in 1905, when some of the leaders among the English women, particularly Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters, abandoned their peaceful methods of agitation and resorted to disorder and rioting, which they knew had been effective in the movement for manhood suffrage. In the winter of 1907-1908 the women suffragists organized demonstrations before the houses of cabinet officers and raided the House of Commons; and many of them, on being arrested, refused to pay their fines and were sent to jail. These disorders proved effective in centering attention on the demands of the women. Parliament, however, refused to pass any bill granting suffrage to women, and several years were spent in seemingly fruitless agitation. At the outbreak of the war the militant party, under the leadership of Mrs. Pankhurst, announced that they would suspend agitation for the suffrage during the period of the war and devote themselves unreservedly to the service of their country. During the war the women of England did, in fact, render the most valiant service as nurses, as munitions workers, and in a thousand other capacities. Largely in consequence of this patriotic activity the resistance to women's suffrage in England was greatly weakened.

**864. Great Britain becomes a Democracy (1917).** So when the "Representation of the People" bill was passed in 1917 the vote was given not only to all adult males who had resided in a district for six months but to all women over thirty years of age who

“occupy” land or houses or are wives of “occupiers.” This bill, it is estimated, has enfranchised about six million women. It will be noted that a woman has to be older and somewhat better off than a man to vote. At last England became a democracy in 1917, after a century or more of agitation (§§ 617–633). It is essentially a republic in government in spite of its king and its now weakened House of Lords.

**865. Irish Home Rule Bill (1912).** The old question of Irish Home Rule had slumbered for a number of years after Gladstone’s last futile attempt in 1893 to get his bill passed (§§ 672 ff.), and those opposed to the measure hoped that the various plans of Parliament to help Ireland might serve to reconcile the Irish Nationalists to the existing system. But the leader of the Irish party in the House of Commons, John Redmond, seeing that the conservative House of Lords had lost its former power to block measures, kept the issue alive. In 1912 Asquith and the Liberals introduced a bill providing for an Irish parliament in Dublin, to deal with Irish matters, and the lord lieutenant of Ireland, appointed by the British monarch, was to govern Ireland through ministers responsible to the Irish parliament. The Irish representatives in the English House of Commons were to be reduced from 103 to 42.

**866. Trouble with Ulster Protestants.** This did not satisfy either the extreme Irish Nationalists, who desired complete independence, or the Irish Protestants, who declared that “Home Rule” would mean “Rome Rule.” Two thirds of the people of Ireland are Catholics, and they have an overwhelming majority in three of the four provinces; but in the province of Ulster, with the important city of Belfast, slightly over half the population are Protestant, belonging either to the Church of England or to the Presbyterian church. Here, therefore, the chief opposition to Home Rule centered, and the people of Ulster actually began collecting arms and drilling with a view of resorting to civil war if necessary in order to keep their old influence, although the proposed Irish parliament had no power to touch religious matters.

**867. Attempt to establish an Irish Republic (1916).** Nevertheless the Home Rule Bill became a law in September, 1914,



without the assent of the House of Lords; but it was suspended on account of the outbreak of the war. Redmond announced that the Nationalist Catholic Irish of the south would join with the Protestant Ulstermen in the war against a common enemy. But the suspension of the Home Rule law caused great discontent. In April, 1916, an insurrection broke out in Dublin, led by the Sinn Fein (pronounced *shin fāne*, and meaning "we ourselves"),



FIG. 118. DUBLIN

The fine buildings along this beautiful street were badly injured in the street fighting which took place in 1916. The slums of Dublin furnish a sad contrast with the impressive public buildings in the main street, and most of the rebels were from the very poor

a party which aimed to set up an Irish republic, under its own green, white, and gold flag. British troops were sent over, and the rebellion was suppressed with rifles and machine guns; some three hundred persons were killed in the streets of Dublin, and over five hundred British soldiers lost their lives. The president of the proposed republic and a number of others were executed. Sir Roger Casement, who was caught landing from a German submarine, was condemned as a traitor and hanged. Redmond and most of the Irish Nationalists remained loyal to the British king, but condemned the harsh punishment of the rebels.

After bitter discussion the matter was turned over to Lloyd George, who, as prime minister, submitted the problem of framing an Irish constitution to a national Irish convention. This broke up in a few months without reaching a solution. A serious crisis developed, and after a period of disorder and bloodshed Ireland was declared a "free state" practically independent of Great Britain (see §§ 1071-1072 below).

#### IV. GERMANY AS A WORLD POWER

**868. Changed View of German History.** The World War, which opened in 1914, naturally changed the attitude of many nations toward Germany, especially those that were engaged in the conflict against her. Hence no one can view the history of that country in the same way that he did before the outbreak of the terrible struggle which is described in a later chapter. For various reasons the chief interest in Germany's development between the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890 and the outbreak of the World War is likely to center in three main questions: (1) What prevented the Empire from developing into a democratic government along the lines followed by England? (2) What changes brought Germany into a sharp rivalry with England, France, and Russia? (3) How did the German government become so powerful that it felt strong enough to defy nearly all the other countries on the earth, including the United States of America?

**869. Development of German Democracy Checked.** Though the constitution of the German Empire gave every adult male the right to vote for members of the Reichstag, or lower house of Parliament, the majority in that chamber did not have the right to choose the ministers and control the government, as in England. Emperor William II, supported by the officers in the army and navy, members of the landed aristocracy, and other influential classes, stoutly opposed all movements in that direction. For one thing, such a change would have deprived them of their high powers and transferred authority to the people. Again, opponents of the change said it would make the civilians supreme over the army and weaken

national defenses against two powerful foes united by an alliance: Russia on the east and France on the west.

It is true that by 1912 there was a strong sentiment in Germany in favor of making the governing cabinet responsible to the Parliament; it is also true that the emperor had been compelled to pay more attention to the demands of the Parliament; but in theory and largely in practice the ministry was responsible to the emperor and not to the majority in the Reichstag.

**870. The Emperor's Personal Intermeddling in Politics.** For many years after his accession in 1888 William II tried to increase his personal power. He quarreled with Bismarck and dismissed him because the old minister, as head of the Prussian government, insisted that the emperor should not deal *directly* with the other members of the cabinet but should act only through his prime minister. Once rid of Bismarck, William made innumerable speeches and proclamations on all kinds of topics, such as politics, religion, the glory and power of Germany, foreign affairs, and socialism. He said that he wanted to improve the condition of the working classes, that he wanted Germany to be strong enough on land and sea to defend herself against all enemies, that Germany ought to have a more important place on the earth. He held a very high opinion of himself and of his ability as a ruler, and during his reign there was an increase in the number of persons arrested for speaking critically of the emperor.

Not content with discussing home affairs, William took a hand in foreign affairs. For example, in 1896, when a raid on the Transvaal Republic engineered by Englishmen failed, William sent a telegram to Paul Kruger, president of the Boer republic, congratulating him on his escape. This naturally made the British government and many English editors very angry. Again, in 1898, when the United States took the Philippines away from Spain, William tried to get some "spoils," as he called them, in the settlement. Of course, in doing all these things, he professed a great desire to do good to the German people, to promote the Christian religion, and to advance peace on earth; but all the time he was trying to magnify himself and enhance his imperial authority.



**871. German Business Prosperity.** Among the things that gave Germany a great increase in power and brought her into collision with England, Russia, and France was the enormous growth of German business and trade in all quarters of the world. This prosperity was partly due to the fact that the German people had been united into a great empire. It was also partly due to the promotion of natural science in universities and research laboratories and to




FIG. 119. BRIDGE ACROSS THE RHINE AT MAINZ

This long bridge spans the Rhine where, over nineteen hundred years before, Julius Cæsar built a bridge to subdue the barbarian Germans of that day. Wooden stakes and iron spikes of Cæsar's bridge are kept in the museum at Mainz

the industry of the German people. In a large measure it depended on the success of the great iron and steel industries that centered in western Prussia along the Rhine and in Saxony. Under German captains of industry the deposits of iron along the Moselle in Lorraine, taken away from France in 1871 (§ 537), were opened up, and the production of iron ore increased with breath-taking rapidity. Before long the German output exceeded that of Great Britain. At the beginning of the World War, Germany stood next to the United States in the amount of iron and steel produced annually, and thus had an abundance of war materials.



**872. Improvement in the Condition of the People.** Parallel with the gain in wealth went an increase in population. In 1870 there were about 40,000,000 inhabitants in Germany; in 1914 the number stood at approximately 68,000,000, a larger increase than was shown by any other country in western Europe. This meant, of course, more soldiers to fight as well as more working people for industries.

In this development new cities sprang up, often well planned so as to give the people more light, air, and comfort in their homes. Other cities did away with their narrow streets, abolished their slums, and spread out along miles of wide boulevards, as new as those in Detroit. With a view to the prevention of overcrowding in the cities, a number of municipalities, like Berlin, Munich, Leipzig, and Hanover, purchased great areas of land. In this way, they kept the profit arising from the increase in land values in the hands of the city-government and prevented private owners from asking high prices for the land and forcing up the rents. Several cities were laid out into zones, and the building in each zone was restricted by law, to stop overcrowding. Some of the more enterprising cities owned street-car lines, gas works, electric-light plants, and slaughterhouses. They managed theaters, furnished music to the people, built homes for the working people, and attempted to control the growth of suburbs in such a way as to prevent the unsightly and insanitary conditions often supposed to be unavoidable in factory towns.

So great was the increase in the prosperity of the German people that the German migration to the United States and South America dropped to a low point. It was easy to get work at home, and prosperity was general. Even the peasants could improve their hard lot as the demand for their farm produce rose with the growth of business.

**873. Increase of Foreign Trade.** This rapid internal development of Germany was due in no small measure to the growth of German trade everywhere in the world—Asia, Africa, and the Americas, as well as Europe. Within a decade Germany doubled the amount of her foreign business. In 1894 the value of German foreign trade was about \$1,700,000,000; ten years later it was

\$3,500,000,000, in round numbers. This meant that German bankers, traveling men, and "business boosters" were busy everywhere trying to sell German goods to other nations just as the same classes in other countries were trying to sell their goods. It also meant that the German government was eager to get all the territories and trade privileges—not yet secured by France, Great Britain, Holland, Russia, and the United States (§§ 569–572)—that it could buy or seize in various places.

**874. Coöperation between the German Government and Business.** To promote the growth of industry at home and trade abroad the German government did everything it could to aid business men. It granted money to steamship companies (subsidized them) so that they could operate in all the waters of the world in competition with steamship companies of other countries. For the purpose of protecting this commerce the German government steadily increased its navy, so that it could have battleships and gunboats to send anywhere on a moment's notice whenever business men or missionaries got into trouble. With a view to keeping domestic trade in German hands it put high protective tariffs on foreign goods coming into Germany. In other words, the German government backed business men, and business men backed the government. It was hard to tell where the work of the one began and that of the other ended.

**875. Germany a World Power.** Instead of being satisfied with this peaceful progress and growing business, a great many German leaders thought they had more grounds for discontent than ever. Until about 1890 the Germans had been deeply engaged in domestic affairs, trying to establish unity and "adjust their frontiers." After that time, as their foreign trade grew, they took an increasing interest in what was going on in all parts of the world. But when they began to seek trade and territories abroad they found that England, France, and other rivals had got ahead of them and taken about everything available. The Germans studied history, and read how England had by her naval power wrested India and Canada from France and deprived the Dutch of various colonies, and how the French had seized territory in Asia and Africa at will.

So German imperialists complained that they had been cheated out of their "place in the sun." They lamented the fact that millions of Germans had been compelled to migrate to the United States and South America, instead of to German colonies where they would increase the power of the fatherland. "We must see to it," exclaimed the historian Treitschke, a spokesman of this party, "that the outcome of our next successful war is the acquisition, by whatever means, of *colonies*." With such ideas in mind the German Navy League (a patriotic organization modeled on one in England) and other patriotic societies began to clamor for steady increases in the army and navy to defend the country and to advance its interests abroad. While it is true that not many German people joined these societies, they wielded an influence greater than their numbers seemed to warrant, for they had money and could keep paid agitators working among the masses.

**876. The German Idea of National Defense.** The views of the German military and naval party were well stated by the Prussian Crown Prince when he said, in 1913: "Our country is obliged more than any other country to place all its confidence in its good weapons. Set in the center of Europe, it is badly protected by its unfavorable geographic frontiers and is regarded by many nations without affection. Upon the German Empire, therefore, is imposed more emphatically than upon any other people of the earth the sacred duty of watching carefully that its army and its navy be always prepared to meet any attack from the outside. It is only by reliance upon our brave sword that we shall be able to maintain that place in the sun which belongs to us and which the world does not seem to be very willing to accord to us."

How many German people believed that the army and the navy were merely for "defense" and how many expected to use them in the next war to get more territory at the expense of their neighbors, no one can tell. But one thing is clear; namely, that there was a large party in Germany bent on following the example of other imperialist powers and winning more land in the next war. This made the German military party a real menace to England, Russia, and France in particular, for those three countries owned most of

the earth that did not belong to independent nations. In short, German industry, trade, army, and navy could not increase indefinitely without coming into conflict with the other great powers of the world.

**877. German Imperial Policy.** Nor was all this a mere theory with German imperialists. Whenever there was trouble in any part of the world involving German interests, the German government took a hand in the affair. In 1898, during the war between Spain and the United States, the kaiser "sounded" Great Britain with a view to getting her to join in dividing any territory that might be annexed at the end of the conflict. Only when he was bluntly informed that Great Britain would not help, and that the United States intended to keep what had been won by the sword, did William II desist from interference. He managed, however, to induce Spain to sell the Carolines and some other small islands in the Pacific to Germany at a good price. The next year (1900) Germany joined the other powers in suppressing the Boxer rebellion in China (§ 810), the first over-sea military expedition since the establishment of the Empire. Not long afterwards, when France and England were dividing up Morocco, Germany intervened to assert the claims to her business men to a share in the good things (§ 829). In these cases and in other ways the German government made it known that it intended to use its army and navy in advancing and protecting its trade whenever opportunity offered.

**878. Growth of Socialism in Germany.** And yet while Germany's industries were growing, her foreign trade increasing, and her army and navy gaining strength, the Socialist party, which proposed to overthrow capitalism (§ 577) and opposed both imperialism and militarism, gained new members by the thousands. All through the period between 1890 and 1914 the country was divided into many political parties: Catholics (or Center party), Conservatives, Social Democrats, National Liberals, Independent People's Party, Alsatians, Danes, and Poles, to say nothing of minor groups. At no time during this period did any one of these groups command the vote of a majority of the German people.



In the election of 1907 the Center party and the Conservatives won 168 seats in the Reichstag out of 397, and governed the country as a "black and blue bloc." At the 1912 election, the last before the war, the Socialists gained 110 seats and ousted the "black and blue bloc," which lost 45 seats in the contest. Thus, just when war was declared, the Socialists, the strongest opponents of imperialism and militarism, formed the largest single party in the Reichstag and would have governed the country if the English system of ministerial responsibility (§§ 634-639) had existed in Germany. The German military party, which was hoping for a foreign war to enlarge the Empire, was threatened by an attack at home. No doubt many of the militarists rejoiced in the war, which enabled them to put most of the Socialists in the army.

## V. FRANCE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

**879. Changed Views of Modern France.** If the World War changed many views about Germany, it altered probably as many opinions about France. For a long time before that conflict began, there was an opinion abroad in England and the United States to the effect that France was an outworn country already in a decline. It was the fashion to speak of "the volatile" French and of France as "the home of revolutions." But since the amazing display of military power in the World War, people are beginning to wonder how it was that France, beaten and humiliated in 1870, managed to recover her position as a great nation and to show such extraordinary strength on the field of battle.

**880. Solid Conservatism of the French.** In point of fact the old view of France was superficial. Between 1890 and 1914 it was, as it had been, a country with a large number of prosperous farmers who owned their land and preferred to invest their savings in government bonds or foreign loans rather than spend them on luxuries. They were quite happy to leave things as they happened to be, so long as they could till their fields in peace and were not too heavily burdened with taxes. The shrewd well-to-do merchants of the towns were much of the same mind. Hence, when any very

radical reforms were proposed, farmers and merchants were usually strong enough to defeat them. In reality, most of the revolutions in France since 1789 had been manufactured in Paris, and relatively few people had taken part in them. Moreover, the successive governments—by a king, a republic, or an emperor—had made no sudden breaks in the way public business was administered.

**881. Significance of Frequent Cabinet Changes.** During the earlier decades of the Third Republic the cabinet was defeated




FIG. 120. THE OPERA HOUSE, PARIS

The Opera House is the most magnificent building devoted to music in the world, and was begun by Napoleon III but completed under the Third Republic. On opening nights high officials of the government come in state. But once a month free performances by the best artists are given, open to the people of Paris; for the French government, like other European governments, supports art by national subsidies. (See picture of interior facing page 330.)

and changed and a new prime minister was elected to power every few months. This was regarded in England and America as indicating an unstable temper and bad management. But, as a matter of fact, in these frequent "crises" few important changes were made in policy. Seldom was a new cabinet made up entirely of new men. Usually just a few officers were ousted to make room for

men of slightly different views. In the main, the frequent crises were due to the fact that France, like Germany, had a number of small parties, and not two great parties like England or the United States. Every French cabinet was a coalition of men belonging to several political groups; and if one group got angry about anything and withdrew, then the whole cabinet "fell."

**882. Conservatism in Social Reform.** The moderate theories of most French parties were shown in their social reforms. It was not until 1910 that France established a thoroughgoing system of old-age and disability pensions. In other words, France did not provide pensions for aged working people and make public grants to persons disabled in industry through sickness or accident until long after Germany had started the idea. Neither did French cities go as far as German cities in what was called municipal socialism; that is, municipal ownership of electric-lighting plants, street railways, houses for workmen, and similar public projects. In short, while France was more democratic in the plan of her government than Germany, she was not so radical in matters of economic reform. If the French government separated Church and State (§ 602), to the dismay of Catholics, the French people remained loyal on the whole to the church of their ancestors.

**883. Slow Growth of Population and Industries.** Unlike Germany, France did not increase rapidly in population. Between 1876 and 1906 the number of inhabitants only rose from 36,900,000 to 39,250,000, and between 1906 and 1911 there was actually a decrease of about 2000, showing that the population had a tendency to decline. Thus, while Germany was recruiting millions of able-bodied men for industries and the army, France was barely holding her own.

Nor did French industries increase with the same rapidity. By a law passed in 1889 France practically gave up the old policy of free trade, adopted about twenty years before, and started a system of protective tariffs similar to that in force across the Rhine. Moreover, great efforts were made to stimulate markets in the colonies recently acquired overseas. But France was handicapped in one great respect—the lack of sufficient iron ore. Although she

had the coal, her best supplies of iron had been wrested from her in 1871, when Germany annexed Alsace-Lorraine. Yet it would be a mistake to think of France in this period as primarily an agricultural country with little industry. As a matter of fact, there were in 1911 more French people engaged in manufacturing and trade than in agriculture, and the foreign commerce was steadily increasing. Perhaps the chief economic difference between France on the one side and England and Germany on the other lay in the fairly even balance which the French people maintained between farming and manufacturing.

**884. Expansion of the French Colonial and Trading Empire.** But while trying to hold the scales fairly between agriculture and manufacturing, the French government and French bankers worked hard at extending their colonial possessions and making loans abroad. As we have seen (§§ 611-616) the Third Republic acquired great territories in Africa and southeastern Asia, besides some important islands, such as Madagascar. Significant also for French business men were the great loans which the French made to other governments and other business men in various parts of the world. Especially heavy were the loans to Russia to pay for building railways, electric-light plants, and factories, for opening up mines, and, above all, for military purposes. Wherever opportunity offered, therefore, French business men were on the ground with goods to sell and money to lend, just like the business men of Germany and England. Wherever a quarrel arose, such as the dispute over the Boxer rebellion, French armies were used to protect French interests. In Morocco, especially, the French were active at the opening of the twentieth century in increasing their military control and their trade. Indeed, it was there that the French came into the sharpest collision with the Germans, who were trying to get more business for themselves in the same region. In short, France, like Germany and Great Britain, was a world power.

And, like them, she was at great pains to keep her military and naval forces up to a high standard for the purpose of defending and protecting her territory and possessions. In 1895 the French standing army was slightly smaller than the German army, in 1910 it



was equal to that fighting machine, and in 1914 it had 34,000 more soldiers under arms than its rival. On the sea the French government did not attempt to compete with England. It did maintain a navy of considerable strength; but after certain secret understandings reached with Great Britain in 1906 it concentrated on building up the army,—relying upon British aid on the ocean in case of a war with Germany.

## VI. THE SOCIALISTIC MOVEMENT

**885. Revolutionary Tendencies.** Among the uncertain factors in Europe at the opening of the twentieth century were the socialists. They had appeared in all the countries where factories were springing up (§§ 444-448), and they had grown rapidly in numbers as the new century advanced. In Germany, as we have seen, they became the strongest political party in the Empire. In England and France, besides carrying on a peaceful agitation, some of the extreme socialists resorted to strikes and violent methods to stir up the people and gain their ends. For example, in 1911, when the English railway employees struck, they began rioting in the railway centers, brought about the interference of the government, and secured a decided increase in wages. Such tactics were called "direct action." Direct action was also much used in France (it was known there as "sabotage"), and strikes were often accompanied by violence. The "direct actionists" in France proposed to organize workmen into "one big union" and to get control over industry and government by the sheer strength of their numbers and organization. In these circumstances the governments of Europe were uncertain as to what the socialists might do in a time of crisis.

**886. Anti-War Theories of the Socialists.** From the beginning of the movement at the middle of the nineteenth century the socialists, who believed the doctrines of Karl Marx (§ 447), were strongly opposed to war. Not many of them were pacifists in the sense that they opposed defending their country by arms; but most of them declared that wars were nothing but quarrels between kings and capitalists over territory and trade, and, holding that view, they

concluded that working people received no benefits from wars, but had to pay dearly for them in taxes, wounds, and death. Extremists among the socialists took the view expressed in the *Communist Manifesto* (§ 447, note): "The workers have no country. What they have not got cannot be taken from them."

**887. The First International.** On one thing practically all the socialists agreed in theory; namely, that working people of all countries were comrades, and in that spirit they held international conferences from time to time to discuss common problems. In 1864 they organized an International Workingmen's Association, known now as the "First International." Karl Marx drew up their program. For twelve years this association held periodical meetings and kept a central office, first in one country and then in another. But it was torn by disputes over methods, and in 1876 it expired. At that time its office was in New York City.

**888. The Second International.** About ten years later socialists began to hold international conferences again, and in 1891 a new association, called the "Second International," was formed. This organization held world conventions every three or four years and maintained a general headquarters. It admitted to membership various national associations "which adhered to the essential principles of socialism," and also labor unions which did not take part in politics directly. Its purpose was to unite the working people of the world to advance and protect their common interests. (For the Third International see § 1060, below.)

**889. The Anti-War Policy of the Second International.** At their world conventions the socialists often discussed the question as to what they should do in case they were threatened with a war. At the Stuttgart conference of 1907, and again at Copenhagen three years later, they debated this question hotly. Some extremists proposed that in such circumstances socialists should attempt to prevent war by calling a general strike in all industries. This project was defeated; but it was agreed that socialists should resort to "every effort to prevent war by all means which seem to them appropriate," and that if war came in spite of their labors they should do their best to bring it to a close. To that was added the ominous

agreement to use all their energies to "rouse the mass of the people from their slumbers and to hasten the fall of capitalist dominion."

Hence the governments of Europe did not know just how far they could count on socialist aid in war. It so happened, however, that, when war came in 1914, practically all the socialists rushed to help their respective governments, usually on the ground that they were defending their countries against invaders. But in the course of the war, when Germany, Austria, and Russia collapsed, it was the socialists who seized power and undertook to set up a new order of affairs (§§ 992, 1021, 1047). Even in France and England the governments sought to win the support of the socialists and admitted some of their leaders to office as an evidence of good will. It was clear that with the growth of democracy and radical ideas the conditions of politics and war in Europe had changed fundamentally since the days of Louis XIV.

### QUESTIONS

I. What are the main topics treated of so far? Would it be possible to write a parallel volume of modern European history, emphasizing different things? Mention the chief reforms of the French Revolution and of the nineteenth century. What are the chief evils we have still to meet?

II. Describe the political temper of England at the close of the nineteenth century. What political change occurred in 1906? Trace briefly the history of socialism in England. Review the history of labor legislation in England from 1897 to 1908. Mention the most important points made by Mr. Charles Booth in his survey of London poverty.

What is the modern view regarding the possibility of abolishing poverty? State the provisions of the old-age pension law of 1908. What means have been taken to lessen the amount of unemployment? In what way has an attempt been made to regulate wages in "sweated" trades? By what measures did the House of Lords seek to block the reforms of the Liberals? What was the "revolutionary budget" of 1909?

III. Under what circumstances was the budget finally passed? Outline the Parliament Act of 1911. Give the main provisions of the National Insurance Act of 1912.

What progress has been made in local reforms during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries? In what sense is Great Britain both a democracy and an aristocracy? Trace the history of Irish Home Rule to 1916.

IV. How was the growth of democratic government checked in Germany? What part did Emperor William II take in public affairs? Give the secret of Germany's progress in wealth and importance. Describe some of the things done by the government to improve living conditions. What steps were taken to promote foreign trade, and what effect did this have upon national ideals? What was meant by "winning a place in the sun"? On what ground was German military policy based? State the attitude of the socialists toward "imperialism."

V. How did the war change American views of France? Why may we call the French "conservative"? Explain the numerous changes in the French cabinet. Compare the industrial and imperial development of France with that of Germany. What was the French scheme of national defense?

VI. What theories did the socialists hold respecting war? What was the First International? the Second International? What agreement did the Second International make with regard to war? Why did European governments have to deal carefully with the socialists?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Studies in Source Materials.** ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, Vol. II: (1) individualism and socialism in England, pp. 470-472, 478-489, 495-497; (2) German socialism, pp. 489-495; (3) socialism and imperialism in France, pp. 233-238.

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) social reform in England, pp. 307-319; (2) politics in France, pp. 361-367; (3) the progress of Italy, pp. 367-378; (4) growth of German imperialism, pp. 421-426; (5) the Austro-Hungarian Empire, pp. 429-435. SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (6) the labor movement in European countries, pp. 570-602; (7) the woman movement in Europe, pp. 603-610.



## CHAPTER XXVII

### PROGRESS OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE AND INVENTION

#### I. THE GREAT AGE OF THE EARTH; DEVELOPMENT OF LIVING THINGS

**890. Influence of Scientific Discoveries and Invention.** Perhaps even more important than the various events we have been reviewing have been the scientific discoveries during the past hundred years and the changes they have wrought in the ideas and daily life of civilized mankind. Great as were the achievements of the eighteenth century, mentioned in an earlier chapter, those of the nineteenth were still more startling. In order to appreciate this we have only to recollect that the representatives of the European powers who met together at Vienna after Napoleon's fall had not only never dreamed of telegraphs, telephones, electric lights, and electric cars, which are everyday necessities to us, but they knew nothing of ocean steamships or railways, of photography, anæsthetics, or antiseptics. Such humble comforts as matches, kerosene oil, illuminating gas, and our innumerable india-rubber articles were still unheard of. Sewing machines, typewriters, and lawn mowers would have appeared to them wholly mysterious contrivances whose uses they could not have guessed.

The progress of science in the twentieth century bids fair, with our ever more refined means of research, to solve many another deep mystery and add enormously to man's power and resources. It should be the aim of every student of history to follow the development of science and to observe the ways in which it is constantly changing our habits and our views of man, his nature and possibilities. It will be possible here to do no more than suggest some of the more astonishing results of the scientific research which has been carried on during the past hundred years with ever-increasing ardor and success in both Europe and America.

**891. Great Age of the Earth.** To begin, modern geologists now believe that it must have required a hundred million, perhaps even a billion, years for the so-called "sedimentary" rocks to be laid down in the beds of ancient seas and oceans. Many of these rocks contain fossils, which indicates that plants and animals have existed on the earth from very remote periods. Accordingly it seems possible that for at least a hundred million years the earth has had its seas and its dry land, differing little in temperature from the green globe familiar to us.

Even if we reduce this period by one half, it is impossible to form more than a faint idea of the time during which plants and the lower forms of animals have probably existed on the earth. Let us imagine that a record had been kept during the past fifty million years, in which but a single page should be devoted to the chief changes occurring during each successive five thousand years. This mighty journal would now amount to ten volumes of a thousand pages each; and scarcely more than the last page (Vol. X, p. 1000) would be assigned to the whole recorded history of the world from the earliest Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions to the present day.

**892. Lyell's Work in Geology.** As early as 1795 the Scotch geologist James Hutton published his conclusion that the earth had gradually assumed its present form by slow natural processes. In 1830 Sir Charles Lyell published his famous *Principles of Geology*, in which he explained at great length the manner in which the gradual contraction of the globe and the action of rain and frost had, through countless æons and without any great general convulsions or cataclysms, formed the mountains and valleys and laid down the thick beds of limestone, clay, and sandstone. He showed, in short, that the surface of the earth was the result of familiar causes, most of which can still be seen in operation. The work of more recent geologists has tended to bear out Lyell's views by adding much new evidence for his conclusions.

**893. Darwin and his Theories.** Even in the eighteenth century it began to be suspected by investigators that plants and animals had slowly developed through the ages. Charles Darwin was the first, however, to advance such careful arguments for this view

that it was accepted by large numbers of people. In his famous book *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, published in 1859, he maintained that the various species of animals and plants—all the different kinds of trees and shrubs, fishes, snakes, birds, and mammals—were not descendants from original separate and individual species created in a certain form which they had always kept, but that these species as they exist in the world to-day were the result of many changes and modifications which have taken place during the millions of years in which plants and animals have lived upon the earth.


The theory that higher and more complicated kinds of animals and plants are derived from earlier lower and simpler ancestors is called *evolution*. This theory of development, although more disturbing to the older ideas of the world than the discovery of Copernicus that the earth revolves around the sun, made its way more rapidly. To-day a large majority of zoölogists, botanists, geologists, and biologists, and, indeed, a great part of those who have received a scientific training, accept this theory.

Many recent investigators feel, however, that Darwin's attempted explanations of this development are, as he himself freely admitted, only partial and quite inadequate to account for the origin of existing living things. So the whole question still remains a great mystery, even to scientists.

## II. DISCOVERIES IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE

**894. Discovery of the Cell.** While it has so far been impossible to discover the way in which one species could arise from another, a vast amount has been found out about the way in which individual plants and animals grow and develop from the tiny germ or egg from which all of them have their start. About 1838 two German naturalists, Schleiden and Schwann, one of whom had been studying plants and the other animals, compared their observations and reached the conclusion that all living things were composed of minute bodies, which they named *cells*. The cells are composed of a gelatinous substance to which the name *protoplasm* was given in






© Ewing Galloway, N.Y.

NAPLES AQUARIUM





© Ewing Galloway, N.Y.

A MODERN SCIENTIST IN HIS LABORATORY

1846. All life was shown to have its beginning in this protoplasm, and the old theory that very simple organisms might be generated spontaneously was shown to be a mistake.

Many very low organisms, such as bacteria, the amœba, and other tiny creatures, consist of a single cell; and all living creatures, whether toadstools or men, spring from a germ consisting of a single cell. But in its maturity the human body is supposed to contain over twenty-six billions of cells, each of which was due to the division of a previous cell, and all of which came from a single original cell called the germ, or egg. All these cells are not alike, however, but have particular functions—those of the brain being different from those of the liver or muscles. Just as in a city one group of individuals does one thing, and another group makes another contribution to the common welfare, so in the body.

The cell theory underlies the study of biology and is shedding a flood of light upon the manner in which the original cell, or egg, from which all animals come, develops and gradually gives rise to all the tissues and organs of the body. It has helped to explain many diseases and in some cases to suggest remedies, or at least rational methods of treatment. The human body and the functions of its various organs and their relations to one another; the extraordinary activities of the blood corpuscles; the nerves, and their head and master, the brain—all these subjects and many others have been studied in the ever-increasing number of laboratories and well-equipped hospitals which have been founded during the past century. It is clear enough, in the light of our present knowledge, that the physicians of former days relied upon drugs and other treatments which were often far worse than nothing.

**895. Vaccination.** In 1796 Edward Jenner first ventured to try vaccination, and thus found a means of prevention for one of the most terrible diseases of his time. With the precautions which experience has taught, his discovery would doubtless rid the world of smallpox altogether if vaccination could be everywhere enforced; but there are always great numbers of negligent persons as well as some actual opponents of vaccination who will combine to give the disease, happily much diminished in prevalence, a long lease of life.

**896. Use of Anæsthetics introduced (1840-1850).** Some fifty years after Jenner's first epoch-making experiment, operations began to be made on patients who had been rendered unconscious by the use of an anæsthetic; namely, ether. Chloroform soon began to be used for the same purpose. That certain drugs would reduce or destroy pain was known to the Greeks, the ancient Chinese, and even in the Middle Ages. In 1800 Sir Humphry Davy, a famous English chemist, ad-



FIG. 121. JOSEPH LISTER

vocated the use of nitrous oxide (laughing gas) in surgical operations. Faraday, another English chemist, showed, in 1818, that the vapor of ether could be used to produce anæsthæsia. American surgeons began to apply these discoveries in the forties, and Dr. Long of Georgia and Dr. Morton and Dr. Warren of Boston did much to bring ether into use. In 1847 Dr. Simpson of Edinburgh began to advocate the use of chloroform. Like most discover-

ies, that of producing anæsthesia cannot be attributed to the insight of any single person. Before the discovery of anæsthetics few could be induced to undergo the terrible experiences of an operation; even the most unsympathetic surgeon could not bring himself to take the necessary time and care as the patient lay under his knife. Now operations can be prolonged, if necessary, for an hour or more with no additional pain.

**897. Germ Theory of Disease and Antiseptics.** But even after the discovery of anæsthetics surgical operations were usually fatal, for the wound was apt to become infected. Joseph Lister, an English surgeon, hit upon the idea of keeping his instruments scrupu-



lously clean and protecting the wound in various ways, and thus managed to reduce the number of cases that went wrong. In 1863 Pasteur, a French chemist, claimed that a virulent kind of ulcer was due to minute organisms, which he called bacteria. He found that bacteria were very common in the air, and that it was they that produced infection. Koch of Berlin discovered the germ of tuberculosis, and other investigators have found the germs of pneumonia, diphtheria, lockjaw, etc.

**898. The Modern War on Various Disease-producing Bacteria.** At first sight it would seem hopeless to attempt to avoid bacteria, since they are so minute and so numerous; but experience has shown that they can be fended off in surgical cases by a scrupulous sterilization of everything that is employed in operations. That typhoid fever is due ordinarily to impure water or milk, that tuberculosis is spread mainly through the dried sputum of those afflicted with it, that the germs of yellow fever and ma-



FIG. 122. LOUIS PASTEUR

laria are transmitted by the mosquito—all suggest obvious means of precaution which will greatly reduce the chances of spreading the diseases. Moreover, remedies are being discovered in addition to these preventive measures. Pasteur found that animals could be rendered immune to hydrophobia by injections of the virus of the disease. So-called *antitoxins* (counter poisons) have been discovered for diphtheria, lockjaw, typhoid fever, and at least one type of pneumonia, but none has yet been found for tuberculosis. Much remains to be discovered about susceptibility to disease.

**899. Influence of the Mind on the Body.** In the last twenty-five years a new way of treating disease has developed, owing to



the discovery that our state of mind is connected with various sorts of bodily discomfort and disorder. All enlightened physicians recognize this now, and do not rely on drugs to the extent that their predecessors did. They ask us about our secret desires and disappointments, about the shocks and frights of early years which we may have thought that we had forgotten altogether. These experiences of childhood sometimes account for troubles in later life until we are helped to recall them. We may find that we are in a way pretending to be sick when we are only showing our fears and discontents in a bodily way.

The body and the mind are evidently very closely connected. All of us notice that bad news may make us feel sick; that a word may cause what seems to us a sinking of the heart, or make it beat wildly; that anxiety will produce a headache. Consequently nowadays some doctors begin with the body and its ailments, others begin with the mind and its distressing thoughts. Sometimes one way seems best, sometimes the other.

The study of human beings and their feelings is, however, as yet in its infancy, and a vast amount remains still to be found out. As time goes on, it is to be hoped that we shall learn to manage our emotions better as we realize more clearly their nature and causes, and their effects not only upon ourselves but on others.

### III. DISCOVERY OF THE NATURE OF MATTER

**900. The Old Idea of Atoms.** Away back in the time of the Greeks, there were philosophers, as we have seen (the Epicureans), who believed that everything was made of tiny particles of different kinds—hard and soft, round and jagged. These particles, they thought, were flying about and constantly forming new bodies. Some of them would go to make up iron, which would last a long time; others a vegetable, which might quickly decay. The Epicureans called these little particles *atoms*, which means things that cannot be divided. This old idea will give us a start in understanding the way in which modern scientists think about matter.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, when chemistry was

developing rapidly, an Englishman by the name of Dalton found that chemical substances combined in certain definite proportions, which led him to think that all gases, liquids, and even solids were composed of small particles. These he called by the old name—atoms. It was gradually discovered that there were a good many kinds of atoms: hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, and many others.

**901. The Molecule.** As time went on, it was discovered that the atoms combined in little bunches called *molecules* (or little masses). To take well-known examples: A molecule of water has two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen. A molecule of fizzing peroxide of hydrogen which we use when we cut a finger has two atoms of hydrogen and two atoms of oxygen. Baking-soda is made up of molecules consisting of one atom each of sodium, hydrogen, and carbon, and three atoms of oxygen. A molecule of salt has an atom of the gas chlorine and another of sodium. The molecules which we find in sugar or butter or gasoline are very much more complicated, and some molecules are bunches of dozens of atoms.

**902. Nature of Pressure and Heat.** Molecules are always moving about with incredible rapidity, particularly in gases, such as the air we breathe. Air is a mixture of oxygen and nitrogen. These molecules are flying about in every direction; in a room they are constantly beating against the walls, and would knock out the windows and doors if it were not for the molecules of the outside air, which are constantly pounding in the other direction. The hotter things are, the faster the molecules go. When one lights a fire under a steam boiler the molecules of water get so excited that they fly apart into water gas, which we call *steam*, and begin to beat against the inside of the boiler, which they would finally burst if the steam were not allowed to escape. A similar thing happens when the gasoline and air are exploded in an automobile cylinder. The molecules hit the head of the piston so hard that they push it down. Hence what we call the *pressure* of air or steam is just the poundings of these minute and restless molecules.

The molecules of water begin to jump apart and form steam

when the water is raised to the boiling point. When the temperature is reduced to freezing, the molecules quiet down into ice. It appears that all molecules would come to rest if the temperature were reduced to what is called absolute zero; that is, about four hundred and sixty degrees below zero by our thermometer. Scientists have almost been able to reach this point. Let us now turn to the atoms of which the molecules are composed and the discovery of their strange nature.

**903. Incredible Nature of the Atom.** It was long supposed that various kinds of atoms were single particles and quite permanent and indestructible. It is true that there were a number of kinds—eighty or ninety—but it was supposed that each kind stayed the same forever. At the end of the nineteenth century new discoveries were made which have entirely altered this view. It was found that radium, uranium, and various other very heavy atoms tended to fly apart and shoot off portions of themselves into space. Atoms are now known to be something like our solar system. They have a *nucleus*, as it is called, which corresponds to the sun, and then revolving around it are satellites or planets, which are called *electrons*. The lightest and simplest atom is hydrogen, which has one electron. Nitrogen has seven, and radium has no less than eighty-eight, which makes it so complicated that, as we have seen, it does not hold together very well. So, while the molecules seem pretty lively, the atoms are really still more complicated and rapid in the movements of their electrons.

It is calculated that an electron of hydrogen goes round its tiny orbit seven thousand million times in a millionth of a second. The electrons are, in comparison with their size, a long way from the nucleus, so that an atom of hydrogen is perhaps a hundred thousand times as big as either its electron or its nucleus. All atoms, then, are mostly emptiness, just like the solar system. Although a piece of steel looks very firm and solid to us, and very quiet, it is in a state of incredible agitation in its parts. Moreover, it is mostly empty space in which the electrons are revolving about their distant centers, and the molecules, or bunches of atoms, are moving too.

There is no such thing as "dead matter," therefore, for the movements of the electrons, atoms, and molecules in what seems to us a cold, inert stone are so incredibly rapid and complicated as to defy description.

#### IV. HOW THE CHEMISTS CAN NOW CREATE SUBSTANCES OLD AND NEW

**904. Chemistry in Modern Life.** The chemist has been able to analyze the most complex substances and discover just what atoms and molecules enter into the make-up of a plant or the body of an animal. He has succeeded in combining ("synthesizing") atoms in proper proportions to reproduce artificially substances (alcohol, indigo, and perfumes, for example) which had previously been produced only by plants or in the bodies of animals. The chemist is now able to make over two hundred thousand substances, many of which do not occur in nature, and he has been able greatly to improve and facilitate the production of steel by mixing with the iron minute portions of other substances. The agricultural chemist, since he knows just what a plant needs, can, after analyzing the soil, supply those chemicals which are essential to produce a particular crop—whether corn, alfalfa, or sugar cane. He is becoming ever more necessary to the manufacturer, the mine owner, and the farmer, besides standing guard over the public health.

**905. Coal-Tar Products.** The most striking example of the magical arts of the modern chemist is the vast number of useful and beautiful things that can be made from such a seemingly hopeless substance as coal tar. But it happens that coal tar contains a great variety of very complicated and valuable molecules from which thousands and thousands of beautiful dyes (the so-called aniline colors) can be made, if one has the skill and patience. From coal tar can be manufactured also a great variety of exquisite perfumes indistinguishable from those produced from flowers, because they are made of the same atoms and molecules. Some flavoring materials also come from coal tar; it is possible to find combinations that taste exactly like wild cherry or wintergreen. Our medicine



closets are full of drugs and disinfectants which are derived from coal tar. When we have a tooth pulled, the pain may be avoided by the use of a coal-tar drug; and when we listen to a record on the phonograph, we may remember that the disk is a coal-tar product.

As Dr. Slosson has put it: When the daring trader of former days had returned from the Far East after untold hardships by land and sea, the rare and precious goods which he would have brought back would be found on inspection to be made up largely of what we now call coal-tar combinations. "There would be dyes and drugs, perfumes and preservatives; whatever amorous youth would choose to enhance the beauty of his lady love, and whatever pious youth would use to embalm the body of his father; whatever would color the curtains of the palace of the king or the temple of the Deity; whatever would serve to scent the banquet hall or ascend to Heaven as incense from the altar.

"Now these that were the gifts of kings, the prerogative of royalty, the acme of luxury, all these have by the bounty of science been put within the reach of all. To be born to the purple is no longer a distinction; it is the natural heritage of any American babe. King Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like a lady who has all the aniline dyes at her disposal. The shop girl may rival the Queen of Sheba in her employment of perfume—and she often does."

## V. EFFECTS OF GASOLINE AND ELECTRICITY ON OUR LIVES

**906. The Steam Engine and Electricity.** Until the improvement of the steam engine by James Watt (§§ 426 ff.), man had either to do his work himself or to get it done by horses and oxen, water wheels and windmills, and other crude devices. The steam engine enabled him to run his new machines, his locomotives and steamships. All this produced very great changes, as we know. We have still to rely on steam for a great many things, even for generating electricity; but nevertheless the discovery of the dynamo by Faraday (1828) has greatly altered our ways of producing and

utilizing power. The power of a steam engine can be utilized only on the spot; electricity can be conducted over wires to great distances and, with the progress of invention, is now used to run trains and machinery. It will light our houses and even help to heat them. It will operate sewing machines and vacuum cleaners. It will cool a refrigerator or broil a steak. There is an increasing tendency to utilize water power for producing electricity, and miles of railroads are operated by electricity thus generated. Niagara Falls generates the electrical power for great chemical plants.

**907. Supplanting the Steam Engine.** Inventors had long dreamed of another kind of engine which would get its power by explosion rather than by the more gentle pressure of steam. It was not until 1876, however, that Dr. Otto of Cologne devised the first practical engine run by the explosion of a mixture of gas and air. This early gas engine was used for some time before it was discovered that the petroleum product gasoline, which had heretofore been permitted to go to waste in the oil wells, was admirably adapted for use in this type of machine. To-day, as we know, millions of gallons are produced a day and are used to run automobiles, pumps, tractors, submarines, and airplanes.

**908. Advantage of the Gasoline Engine.** None of these strange new devices so familiar to us now would have been possible without gasoline, because the steam engine requires a heavy boiler and a big supply of coal, whereas the gas engine can be made very compact, and the gasoline can be conducted through pipe lines and goes a great deal farther than coal. Hence by using gasoline it was possible to develop the locomotives which now fill our streets in the form of motor cars and to have something light enough to carry up into the sky to propel a craft that had no other footing than the air.

**909. Some Effects of the Gas Engine.** We are already so familiar with automobiles that we scarcely realize what great effects they have had in making it possible to get from place to place easily and rapidly. One may live far from town and still easily take advantage of its resources. Gradually the old farm machinery drawn by horses is giving way to tractors driven by gas engines.

A certain form of these tractors, the so-called tanks, played a great part in the last war, for they were more terrible than any Macedonian phalanx or Roman legion. Great as was the rôle of the submarine in the World War, it would seem as if the aircraft were likely to play a far greater part should there be another war. All these and many other things have come from this new type of engine, and the discovery that gasoline could be used to run it.

## VI. THE NEW HISTORY

**910. Great Extension of History Backward.** Among the branches of human knowledge which have undergone great changes during the nineteenth century is *history* itself. It is now based on far more reliable sources than it was formerly and is more carefully written. Half a century ago history dealt with a very short period in man's long career—mainly the last twenty-five hundred years. During the last half-century a vast amount has been learned about man and his achievements in Egypt and Mesopotamia long before the poems of Homer were written. We now know that writing was used in Egypt some four thousand years before the opening of the Christian Era. In this way the scope of history has been *doubled* and extends through five thousand years instead of twenty-five hundred.

Moreover, much has been discovered in the last fifty years about man before he had learned to write and make records of his experiences and thoughts. As we have seen in Volume I (*History of Europe, Ancient and Medieval*), we can trace his gradual inventions and improvements by his stone tools and utensils, later by the pictures he left on the walls of caves, and still later by the vestiges of his houses found on the shores of the Swiss lakes.

**911. Importance of Recent History.** While our knowledge of the past now extends back far beyond what was known a hundred years ago, we have at the same time come to realize that the more recent the history, the more important it is in enabling us to form a judgment on the problems of our own day. The World War called everyone's attention to the vital importance of understanding Euro-

pean conditions if we were to understand the war and its consequences and the great problems that now face mankind. It will be noticed that almost a third of the present volume is devoted to the developments of the past quarter-century, which concerns us most nearly.

**912. History alone enables us to understand the World of To-day.** We can understand the present only by understanding the past. We each of us have to explain our own lives and circumstances by our own particular past; by our memories and experiences and the conditions in which we happen to have been placed. So it is with mankind in general. One has to realize man's slow struggle up from ignorance and savagery to understand the constant need for reform and the difficulty of carrying it out.

There is no reason to think that we do not still have innumerable reforms to make; for our knowledge is ever increasing and our situation constantly being changed as a result of new knowledge and new inventions, which have revolutionized the life of mankind in the past and will continue to change it in the future, and so raise ever new tasks for the reformer.

**913. The Growing Importance of the History of Science.** It may well be that men of science, not kings or warriors or even statesmen, are to be the heroes of the future. Perhaps during the twentieth century the progress of science and its practical applications may some day be recognized as the most vital element in the history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Our histories may be rewritten. Diderot's *Encyclopedia* might receive more space than the wars of Frederick the Great; and the names of Lyell, Darwin, Lister, Koch, and Pasteur might take a prominent place beside those of Metternich, Cavour, and Bismarck.

For, after all, the real progress of civilization depends less upon statesmen who aspire to control the fate of nations than upon the scientist, the inventor, and the engineer, who give us control of nature and, to some extent, of life itself. From the laboratory comes most of the wealth and power of modern nations. The statesmen of the future must therefore reckon with these new contributions as the statesmen of the past have had to reckon with the new



sea routes which changed the fate of the Mediterranean ports, or with the Industrial Revolution, which readjusted the nations of Europe and led to their expansion throughout the whole world.

**914. Why History often fails to arouse Interest.** The reason why so many people are not interested in history is because the older historical manuals contained so many things that could not be brought into any relation with our own lives and interests. In preparing this volume the authors have accordingly tried to leave out all events that did not seem to help in explaining present conditions and current events. They put nothing in just because it had happened, but included only those matters that are essential to an understanding of how those problems which now face the world have arisen.

## VII. THE AGE OF READING; DEMOCRATIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

**915. Greatly Increased Use of the Printing-Press.** There is nothing that has contributed so greatly to making our own times different from any earlier period as the recent development of the printing-press. Books were scarce in Greek and Roman times, and during the Middle Ages very few people were able to read. We hear of a sort of newspaper in the time of Augustus, but each copy of it had to be written out by slave copyists. With the coming of paper into Europe, during the thirteenth century, and the invention of printing and the printing-press about 1455, there was a possibility of making books more cheaply. For a long time most of them were in Latin, a few being in Greek, very few in the language of the people. Gradually more and more were published in the modern languages, and now almost none are printed in the ancient tongues.

**916. Newspapers and Magazines.** Magazines and journals began to appear in the seventeenth century; in the eighteenth century there were few newspapers, especially before the French Revolution. Even down into the nineteenth century the great majority of people were still unable to read.

Almost all the newspapers and magazines, as we now meet them

in nearly all civilized countries, came into existence during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. In our own country the newspapers and the cheap and popular magazines, which sell by the hundreds of thousands, are largely supported by the money paid for the advertisements which they contain, and it will be noticed that the advertisements receive as much or more attention than the reading matter. This enables the publishers to sell the newspapers and magazines for far less than would otherwise be possible, for the price received from the buyer would often not even pay for the paper used. Recently it has become possible to make very beautiful illustrations which can be cheaply reproduced in colors or otherwise, and which familiarize us with the faces of distinguished writers, statesmen, inventors, and explorers.

**917. Interaction of Reading and Printing.** Reading and printing have gone hand in hand. Had it not been easy to get things to read, people would not have learned to read; and had they not learned to read, there could never have been such a vast amount of reading matter supplied to them. The great mass of mankind prefers the newspaper or the popular magazine to books, because our periodical literature generally aims to interest just as many people as possible. Nevertheless, there are more books published every year, and many of them, especially novels and religious books, reach large numbers of readers.

**918. Effect of Reading on Public Life.** Through the daily newspapers it is possible to keep a whole great nation informed of what is going on and give its people an opportunity to follow current events and form their opinion about them. So printing is connected with democracy—with the giving to everybody, both men and women, a right to vote—for very few would have favored granting this privilege to everyone unless reading had become practically universal.

The older writers rarely dealt with social problems in the same way that many of our novelists and dramatists now do. In the first part of the nineteenth century Carlyle and Ruskin, however, were greatly disturbed by the Industrial Revolution. They hated

the smoky factory towns, and felt that all beauty would soon be crowded out of life. Carlyle wrote many fierce attacks on the factory owners and the manner in which they treated their workmen. Ruskin tried to interest as many people as possible in the art of the Italian Renaissance. Charles Dickens, unlike Walter Scott, did not deal with knights and fine ladies, but often described the lives of poor and miserable Londoners. He devoted much attention to the delays in the English courts of justice and what we may call the general unfairness of things. He was also one of the first to turn his attention to childhood, and many of his characters are children who had a very hard time in life on account of poverty and ill treatment. Daudet in France also began to write about children, and Victor Hugo about the poor and unfortunate.

Our stories and plays, such as those of H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw in England, Brieux in France, and Sudermann in Germany, have much to say of social problems and family problems and bad government; for instance, John Galsworthy has a famous play called *Strife*, describing a strike, and another called *Justice*, dealing with prisons and injustice.

As knowledge has increased, a number of writers have turned their attention to making the new discoveries plain to large numbers of readers. We now have in the United States an organized Science Service, with its headquarters at Washington, which makes a business of sending out accurate but simply expressed accounts of all important new discoveries. It is hoped that in this way the great mass of voters may come to understand the vast importance of scientific work and the necessity of supporting it, because there is always a danger that the ignorant will protest against new ideas and suspect that those who suggest them are bad men.

### QUESTIONS

I. Mention some of the great inventions since the Congress of Vienna. Describe Lyell's discoveries. Why do geologists believe in the great age of the earth? Describe briefly Darwin's theories.

II. What is the cell theory in biology? What can you tell of bacteria? Describe various steps in the development of the science of medicine.

Why should governments give more attention to scientific discovery and its promotion? What departments of our government are devoted to the increase of scientific knowledge? Why do physicians give more attention to the study of the mind than they formerly did?

III. How are the movements of molecules affected by gas pressure and by heat? What can you tell of the modern theory of atoms?

IV. Illustrate the importance of chemistry in our life to-day. Give some examples of coal-tar products.

V. Compare a steam engine with a gas engine. What advantage has the gasoline engine over the steam engine?

VI. How has history been extended back? What arguments can you give for special attention to recent history? Illustrate the way in which history enables us to understand the present. Give some examples of the way in which your own history explains your present situation and interests.

VII. What effects has the great increase in the number of newspapers and magazines had on our lives? How can magazines be sold for less than the cost of the paper in them? Mention some modern novelists and playwrights whose works deal with the problems of their own time.



## CHAPTER XXVIII

### ORIGIN OF THE WORLD WAR

#### I. THE ARMIES AND NAVIES OF EUROPE

**919. The Incredible War of 1914.** In August, 1914, the most terrible and destructive war in the history of the world broke out. Never before had millions and millions of men been ready to march against an enemy at a moment's notice; never before had any European army been supplied with such deadly weapons; never before had any war, however serious, so disturbed the affairs of the whole globe. The war came to most people as a horrible surprise. They could not believe that the European governments would dare take the fearful responsibility of entering upon a war which they all knew would involve untold woe and destruction. Nevertheless war was declared; and since it is, perhaps, the most important single event in the whole history of the world, we must endeavor to see how it came about and what were the great questions involved.

Before taking up the rivalries of the various countries that ended in the World War it is important for us to be on our guard against a certain habit of speech. It is the fashion in everyday life and in history-writing to speak of nations as if they were persons. For example, we say England or Germany or France did this or that, just as we say John Smith had breakfast or Susan Jones went down town. Indeed, most countries are pictured in the popular mind as persons. Do we not refer to the United States as "Uncle Sam," thinking of that benevolent elderly gentleman in a high hat and an old-fashioned suit? England is known as "John Bull," and "la belle France" as a charming maiden of uncertain years. Now, as a matter of fact, we know that the people of any one country are seldom agreed on anything in time of peace, and that when we say "England does this" or "France does that" we really mean that the government does it. And the government in modern democratic

countries is a party government. Usually a government represents a majority of the people for the time being, but it may be thrown out of office if the voters change their mind or disapprove. For instance, in 1920 our president, Woodrow Wilson, favored the League of Nations. The next year his place was taken by a Republican, President Harding, who flatly opposed entering the League. Therefore, in speaking of countries as persons we must bear in mind that we are really speaking of governments, that governments represent a majority, and that all the people in the respective countries do not always approve everything their governments do and say.

**920. Growth of Militarism.** In starting to think about the outbreak of the World War we should remember that the various peoples of Europe had been engaged in fighting for thousands of years before 1914. You know from your Roman history how Julius Cæsar was engaged in wars with the Germans on the Rhine in the century before the birth of Christ. The opening pages of this volume tell how Louis XIV, the king of France, invaded the Rhine provinces from time to time, plundered the people, burned their houses, and seized their territories. In the eighteenth century a powerful rival of France rose in Prussia under the Hohenzollerns. Prussia developed a strong army under Frederick the Great and preyed upon her German and Polish neighbors. Not long afterwards Napoleon, at the head of triumphant French armies, overran all western Europe, defeated the Germans in numerous battles, carved up their territories, and ordered them about like servants.

Now the overwhelming power of Napoleon depended in no small measure on a law passed in France in 1798 making every young man liable to serve in the army from his twentieth to his twenty-fifth year. Of course the idea that every able-bodied man might be called upon for national defense was not new, but conscription, or forced military service, was looked upon as a last resort in time of extreme danger. In contrast, the French law of 1798, although passed as an emergency measure, marked the beginning of a permanent system under Napoleon and, as an eminent English military expert said in 1910, "ultimately compelled all Europe to adopt similar legislation."

The first country to take over the new French system was Prussia. After suffering a terrible defeat at the hands of Napoleon at Jena, Prussia began to build up an army by adopting conscription (§ 340). By a general law then enacted, every able-bodied




FIG. 123. HAMMERING CANNON IN THE KRUPP WORKS, GERMANY

This enormous hammer was made in Sheffield, England, as the plate near the top of it shows. Yet it is installed in the Krupp gun works to make cannon used in the great war against England. The gun barrel, at white heat, lies between anvil and hammer

male subject in Prussia was made liable to military service. Thus Prussia became "a nation in arms." As we know, it was this new army that took an important part in driving Napoleon from German soil and in defeating him finally at Waterloo.

Although the Napoleonic peril was thus destroyed, Prussia did not repeal the conscription law. When, fifty years later, William I and Bismarck were preparing to Prussianize all Germany and foresaw a war with Austria (§ 522), the number of soldiers levied annually was increased and the period of active service

lengthened from two to three years and the term of service in the reserve to four years. In this way Prussia secured an effective army of four hundred thousand troops. With these soldiers she defeated Austria in 1866, overthrew the second Napoleonic empire in 1870, and gained her end of consolidating all the separate states of Germany into the powerful German Empire with the king of Prussia at the head.

**921. Spread of the Military System.** Stung by the defeat of 1870, France adopted two years later a system of "universal and obligatory military service without exemptions and exceptions." In a short time all the European powers, except England, were at work building up greater and greater armies by conscription; that is, they required all the able-bodied men to enter the army for a fixed period and then to hold themselves in reserve to be summoned in case of war. The number which each country had under arms at any one time depended upon the amount of money the government could get and the length of the service—one, two, or three years, as the case might be. To conduct the training of the soldiers and form a permanent body to lead in war, a large number of regular officers was continuously maintained. To furnish supplies—rifles, cannons, powder, clothing, and the like—huge factories were built, which afforded great profits to the owners and made them all ardent supporters of more and better armies.

The result of this system was a steady increase in competition among the powers of Europe. If one added a few thousand soldiers to the army, then all its neighbors felt compelled to do likewise. So, like a rolling snowball, militarism grew as the years passed. Figures are usually dull, but anyone who studies the following table for ten minutes will gain a valuable education in militarism. This table<sup>1</sup> gives the number of men under arms in five countries at three dates:

|                           | 1895    | 1910      | 1914      |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Germany . . . . .         | 585,000 | 634,000   | 812,000   |
| Austria-Hungary . . . . . | 349,000 | 327,000   | 424,000   |
| Italy . . . . .           | 238,000 | 288,000   | 318,000   |
| Russia . . . . .          | 910,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,300,000 |
| France . . . . .          | 572,000 | 634,000   | 846,000   |

**922. The British Navy.** As we have noted, the only European power that did not adopt conscription was Great Britain; but she relied upon her navy, which she kept at a strength equal to that of any two other powers. For this practice Englishmen offered two reasons. The first was that England had a larger population than

<sup>1</sup> Moon, *Syllabus on International Relations*, p. 75.



could be fed from her own farms, and therefore, she had to depend upon food sent from overseas. In the second place, it was said that England, being primarily a manufacturing nation dependent upon trade in all parts of the world, simply had to command the "sea lanes." In other words, England defended her navy on the same ground as the other powers defended their armies—self-protection.

**923. Germany and Naval Rivalry.** It would be a mistake to imagine that the rivalry of the nations was confined mainly to the building up of land armies. On the contrary, the Continental powers, as well as England, claimed that they needed navies also. Russia urged that it was necessary for her to have ships to defend her interests in the Baltic, in the Black Sea, and in the Far East, where Siberia faced the Pacific Ocean. France had colonies and trade in all parts of the earth which called for protection. Germany likewise, as we have seen, began to build a navy as her over-sea business increased. Early in his reign Kaiser William II declared that Germany's future lay upon the sea, and he was deeply stirred on reading a book by an American writer, Captain Alfred Mahan, showing that England's secret lay in keeping her supremacy on the ocean. Beginning about 1895 Germany undertook an extensive shipbuilding program, adding more and more battleships as time passed. Although the German government insisted that its idea was to keep up with France and Russia in this game, England regarded the German navy program as a terrible menace to her supremacy of the sea. So the race kept up. In the ten years between 1904 and 1914 France and Russia spent in round numbers \$1,500,000,000 on their combined navies, Germany and Austria-Hungary \$1,200,000,000, and Great Britain \$1,600,000,000.

## II. FAILURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT TO CHECK ARMAMENTS

**924. The Hague Conference (1899, 1907).** The enormous cost of armaments, together with horror at the thought of a war in which millions would be fighting and using terrible weapons, led many earnest people to try to prevent war altogether.




FIG. 124. A REVIEW OF THE BRITISH FLEET IN JULY, 1914

The first notable movement toward stopping the race in armaments originated with the Tsar, Nicholas II, when in 1898 he proposed a great conference of the powers at The Hague to discuss the problem. Unlike the Congress of Vienna or that of Berlin (§§ 348, 349, 783), the Peace Conference of 1899 did not meet to bring a war to a close: it came together in a time of European peace to consider how the existing peace might be maintained and military expenditures reduced.

But, as a matter of fact, the Hague Conference did nothing to limit armaments. We now know from secret letters of the time, since made public, that the diplomats of England, France, and Germany did not think the Tsar's idea at all practical, and rather laughed in their sleeves at it. The Conference did, however, establish a permanent Court of Arbitration to which international difficulties "involving neither honor nor vital interests" might be submitted for settlement. But no plan was adopted for compelling a nation to submit its grievances to this Court, and the very difficulties most likely to make war were excluded from consideration. At a second Hague Conference, held in 1907, the question of the limitation of armaments was again brought up, but nothing was done to stop the race for military supremacy among the great powers of the world. Certain rules were established in regard to laying mines, bombarding unfortified towns, and the rights of neutrals—rules of civilized warfare—and yet in the test of war they were all violated.

**925. Peace Treaties between Nations.** Within a decade after the first Hague Conference more than one hundred and thirty treaties were made between nations, pledging them to submit to arbitration all disputes which "do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the contracting parties, and do not concern the interests of third parties." Some nations even went so far as to propose treaties binding themselves to submit to arbitration "all questions which are in their nature justiciable in character."

There were many other signs besides the Hague conferences and the different arbitration treaties which encouraged the hope that there would not be another great European conflict. The number of



international societies and congresses was steadily increasing, and there was a general recognition that peoples of different nations had innumerable common interests which they should help one another to promote.

**926. Socialism as an International Movement.** Among the other forces making for international peace, one of the strongest




FIG. 125. THE PEACE PALACE AT THE HAGUE, HOLLAND

This magnificent building was inaugurated as a center for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, in August, 1913—just a year before the war broke out. Andrew Carnegie contributed \$1,500,000 to pay for it

was socialism, which was an international movement of working people with the common aim of getting rid of the private ownership of the "means of production" (§§ 444 ff.). The socialists held great international congresses and referred to each other as "comrades." They constantly criticized governments which embarked on "imperialistic" policies (§§ 684–685), for they claimed that only the rich profited from investments in distant lands and that the wars which might result were not the affair of the working class. Above all, they insisted that the poor suffer most in war. Extreme



socialists were therefore antimilitarists. This meant that they objected to serving in the armies of Europe and were sometimes imprisoned for what was viewed as treason. However, a great majority of the socialists of all countries were carried away by the ardor of the vast conflict which began in 1914, and although they still professed to detest imperialism and wars of conquest, they nevertheless fought against each other in the World War.

### III. INTERNATIONAL RIVALRIES AND COMBINATIONS

**927. Imperialism.** During the opening years of the twentieth century, as we have seen, all the powers of western Europe were eagerly trying to get more trade in distant lands, to lend more money abroad, and to annex new colonies for the purpose of controlling their commerce. This practice is generally called *imperialism* (§§ 683-684).

Imperialism started naturally with trade, as the business men of various countries undertook to sell the goods of their factories to foreigners—especially in Asia, Africa, and South America, where machine industry had not been widely adopted. From trade it was but a step to lending money in the same countries to governments and individuals. The money so lent was used to build railways and factories, to equip mines, and to drill oil wells. The third step in imperialism was taken whenever a local disorder interfered with trade or with money-lending; battleships and soldiers were sent to the spot to establish peace and to collect bills. Frequently such actions ended in the annexation of the region so invaded and the addition of new "colonies" to the possessions of the imperialist country.

Two whole chapters (XXIV and XXV above) are devoted to showing in detail how the rival powers of Europe were engaged at the close of the nineteenth and at the opening of the twentieth century in seizing trading posts and colonies in Asia and Africa. Indeed, a very large part of European history since the age of Christopher Columbus has been the history of "imperialism." And most of the European wars between 1600 and 1900 involved colo-

nies and trade in America, Africa, and Asia. Between 1871 and 1914 there were thirty or forty wars—most of them little wars—fought by Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia in various parts of the earth in their efforts to get more colonies or to keep down uprisings in colonies. During all those years there were endless disputes between European countries over foreign trade, foreign debts, and colonies, all of which were settled by compromises without resort to the sword.


**928. Special Grievances in Europe.** Besides these rivalries in imperialism, there were other sources of discontent among the powers of Europe. Great Britain, having got possession of most of the choice colonies of the world, was fairly content with what she had, but she watched with growing fear the rise of Germany as an industrial and trading nation. In a word, Great Britain saw in the expansion of Germany a menace to her security. France had a very particular grievance in her "lost provinces," Alsace and Lorraine, taken away by Germany in 1871. While the great mass of the French people may have been indifferent, their leaders were not. "From the age of seventeen," said General Foch, "I dreamed of revenge, after having seen the Germans at Metz." Raymond Poincaré, a man born in Lorraine, who became premier of France in 1912, declared, "I could discover no other reason why my generation should go on living except for the hope of recovering our lost provinces."

Germany thought she had grievances because so much of Africa and Asia and so many islands of the seas had been seized by England and France and so little left to her. Russia also had a particular reason for quarreling about her lot. She had no ocean port in Europe or Asia that was free of ice during the winter so that ships could come and go at will all the year round. Beaten by Japan in the war of 1904-1905 in her effort to get an outlet through China, Russia cast longing eyes on Constantinople. Having already many different races under her control, Austria-Hungary was afraid of agitations for self-government among them. Italy complained because Austria ruled many people of Italian birth and also because she, like Germany, could find so few colonies to seize. So, for one

reason or another, all the governments of Europe were looking daggers at their neighbors and wondering whether a war would not help them to improve their lot and satisfy their grievances.

**929. The Triple Alliance.** Now it was obvious to each of the governments of Europe that it could not by itself get what it wanted; that it could not start a war for its own purposes without stirring up trouble elsewhere. Hence the several governments cast about to find friends and allies, offering to trade one thing for another. Without much difficulty Germany and Austria agreed to unite in defending their territories by making in 1879 what is known as the "Dual Alliance." This treaty was arranged, it seems, with the idea that Russia, recently defeated in her attempt to get out to the sea through Turkey, would again disturb the peace as soon as she was able. In 1882 the Dual Alliance became the Triple Alliance by the addition of Italy. This alliance, renewed from time to time, was in force in 1914 when the World War broke out, but Italy declined to join her partners in the fighting. On their face the treaties which held the Triple Alliance together were "defensive"; but on the part of Italy and Austria-Hungary, at least, the later renewals had in view expansion at the expense of their neighbors. Italy was to take some territory away from France in Europe and Africa, and Austria-Hungary was to make additions near at hand.

**930. The Franco-Russian Alliance.** Since Russia had reasons for thinking of a possible collision with Austria-Hungary in southeastern Europe, and since France continued to hope for a recovery of the lost provinces, it was natural for these two countries to draw together against the Central Powers, as Austria-Hungary and Germany were called. As a matter of fact, in 1891 France and Russia concluded a secret treaty binding them in an alliance which was also, on its face, for purely "defensive" purposes. The two governments supplemented this treaty by having their diplomats and military officers hold "conversations" from time to time. In this way they agreed on the number of soldiers they were to have ready and how they were to fight if a war with Germany came to pass. Thus they were all prepared to the last man and the last gun, just like Austria-Hungary and Germany, "if the war should come."







# EUROPE

in 1914

0 100 200 300 400 500  
Scale of Miles.

Longitude West from Greenwich 0 Longitude East from Greenwich 10





**931. Great Britain's System of Understandings.** Alarmed by the growing power of Germany, the British government began to look about for friends. Long a rival of Russia in China and on the frontiers of her Indian Empire, England first sought help against danger there by making a treaty of alliance with Japan in 1902. Three years later England, Japan, and the United States reached a secret understanding about the Far East in which they undertook to uphold the existing arrangement of things against all possible disturbers—meaning, of course, Russia, France, and Germany.

Having found a makeweight against Russia, England then sought a friendly settlement of old disputes with the Tsar. By a formal treaty signed in 1907 the two powers arranged a bargain in regard to what each was to have in Asia, and by later secret "conversations" they agreed on how they would cooperate against Germany should they be drawn into a war with that country. To seal the friendship great Russian loans were floated in England and huge sums were sent to Russia to aid in building railways and factories and in equipping the Russian army and navy. In other words, both countries were all ready in 1914 for what they called "eventualities."

In the meantime Great Britain made, not an alliance, but a number of secret agreements with France about what each was to do in case of a war with Germany. As we have seen, in 1898 Great Britain and France were on the point of war over the "Fashoda incident"—a quarrel over territory in Africa. But six years later France and England came to a "cordial understanding"—or, to use the French phrase, *entente cordiale*—concerning their outstanding sources of dispute. France was to recognize British interests in Egypt, and England was to recognize those of France in Morocco—which country France had begun to penetrate from the Algerian border. The *Entente* was hailed with great delight on both sides. Englishmen cheered French marines marching through the streets of London on a friendly visit, and Frenchmen, under the lead of their newspapers, began to admire English traits which they had not always approved.

Having smoothed out old troubles, Great Britain and France drew closer and closer. In 1906 they began to hold periodical secret



"conversations" on how much and what aid England was to give to France in case of a war with Germany and in case England decided to join France. These conversations were written down in



FIG. 126. THE MUNITION WORKS, LE CREUSOT, FRANCE

France relied much upon its artillery for defense, since Germany had more soldiers, but in the World War of 1914 the Germans had prepared more heavy cannon than the French, who used mainly a lighter gun. The Creusot works are among the largest and most important munition works in Europe. This picture of them is from an etching by the American artist Mr. Joseph Pennell

documents and exchanged, but they were not treaties. It was agreed that England was not bound to enter the war unless she decided to do so when the war came. Yet on the basis of these

agreements France kept her fleet mainly in the Mediterranean and left her Atlantic coasts practically defenseless. She also arranged to use her armies—if the war came—just as if she could confidently count on British help. So Great Britain, France, and Russia were well united by understandings, agreements, and treaties when war opened in 1914; but all these arrangements were secret and the people at large knew little or nothing about them until after the World War was over.

**932. The Moroccan Crisis.** Now these agreements were not mere theories. With respect to the most serious dispute in imperialism between 1904 and 1914—the quarrel over Morocco (§ 829)—France and England stood together like a rock. By a secret agreement England gave France practically “a free hand” in Morocco. But Germany, having some trade and other interests there, made a loud protest against the action of the French in assuming authority over that territory. Indeed, as a kind of threatened gesture, the German government sent a cruiser (the *Panther*) to Agadir, as if to say that France had better consult Germany, or there might be war.

**933. The Moroccan Conference of 1911.** This peril was barely averted by another conference. Both Great Britain and France were extremely angry about Germany’s action, but they agreed to a compromise. France gave some of her Congo territory to Germany in exchange for a recognition of French rights in Morocco. Though war was thus avoided, the newspapers and politicians in all three countries stirred up a great furor. Imperialists in Germany said that their government had been too tender and had not stood up for all the rights of Germans in Morocco. Imperialists in France and England were angered by the bold way in which Germany had acted, and declared that their governments had been intimidated by Germany’s show of the mailed fist and by saber-rattling. They were full of wrath because Germany got anything at all in Morocco. As a result all the governments concerned in these disputes worked more feverishly than ever at increasing their armaments and holding secret conferences about how they would fight in case a war should break out.

## IV. THE NEAR-EASTERN QUESTION

934. **The Balkan Mess.** Although war between Germany and the *Entente* powers was narrowly averted in 1911, the fatal conflict was only postponed. Conditions in the Balkan region, in which Austria-Hungary and Russia were vitally interested, were destined to lead to the final catastrophe that completely destroyed the an-




FIG. 127. THE BOSPORUS


This shows the narrow strait that separates Europe from Asia. The view is taken from the European shore. The towers were built by the Turks when they were preparing to take Constantinople in the fifteenth century

cient dynasties of the Hapsburgs and the Romanoffs with all their ambitions and pretensions and their claims to power by divine right.

In a former chapter we traced the gradual disruption of Turkey during the nineteenth century, and the emergence of the Balkan states of Serbia, Greece, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Russia, it will be remembered, claimed to be the natural protector of the Slavic peoples of the Balkan region. When the Serbian and Bulgarian people, driven to desperation by the atrocities of the Turks, had revolted in 1876, Russia had come to their aid and defeated the armies of the Sultan. Then Austria-Hungary and Great Britain








# SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE 1914

50 45 40 35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0

Scale of Miles.  
0 100 200 300 400

|              |           |
|--------------|-----------|
| Blue         | Russian   |
| Yellow       | Austrian  |
| Orange       | Greek     |
| Light Green  | Rumanian  |
| Dark Green   | Bulgarian |
| Light Purple | Ottoman   |
| Dark Purple  | English   |



45 40 35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0

50 45 40 35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0



had intervened and induced the Tsar to submit the whole Balkan matter to the Congress of Berlin (1878). There it was decided by the powers that Serbia, Rumania, and little Montenegro should be free and independent of the Turkish rule and that Bulgaria should also be independent except for the payment of tribute to the Sultan. The province of Bosnia and the small territory called Herzegovina, to the south, were taken from the Turkish government and turned over to Austria to administer.

**935. Dissatisfaction with the Berlin Settlement.** No one was satisfied with the compromises made at Berlin. A few years later (1885) Bulgaria quietly annexed the district south of her (Eastern Rumelia) and so considerably increased her territory. In 1897 Greece risked a war with Turkey, with the hope of increasing her realms, but was defeated. Turkey, of course, was anxious at all costs to hold on to the remnant of her once large dominion in Europe left her by the Congress of Berlin. She still held Macedonia and Albania. The European powers were well aware of the horrible local massacres, assassinations, and robberies going on in Macedonia under Turkish rule, but they dreaded the general war which might develop if any attempt was made to take the region from Turkey and divide it among the independent Balkan states of Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece, all of which laid claim to it as rightfully theirs. Nevertheless, in 1908, thirty years after the unsatisfactory settlement at Berlin, a series of events began which in six years precipitated the World War.

## V. EXTINCTION OF TURKEY IN EUROPE

**936. The Turkish Revolution of 1908.** During the opening years of the twentieth century there developed in Turkey a small party of reformers, known as Young Turks, who were especially strong in the army, where as officers they had to study the ideas and methods of Western nations. In 1908 a so-called "Committee of Union and Progress" was formed in the Turkish port of Salonica. In July this committee declared that Turkey must have a constitution and that the reformers would march on Constantinople if the



Sultan did not yield. The aged Sultan, Abdul Hamid, did not feel himself in a position to oppose the movement, and so at last even Turkey got something that passed for a constitution. The election of representatives to the Turkish parliament took place, and the assembly was opened by the Sultan with great pomp in December, 1908.

This "bloodless revolution" attracted the attention of Europe, and everyone wondered whether the Young Turks, who were few in number and impractical in their notions of government, would really succeed in reforming such a thoroughly corrupt government as that of Abdul Hamid, for he had hated and cruelly suppressed every tendency toward betterment during his long reign.

**937. Austria annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina.** Bulgaria immediately seized the occasion to declare itself entirely independent of Turkey. Next Austria proclaimed the outright annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the two Slavic provinces of Turkey which she had been managing since the settlement at the Congress of Berlin. She set to work to Germanize them as completely as possible and to suppress all tendencies to join their Slavic relatives in Serbia. A glance at the maps (between pages 532-533) will show how important these provinces were for Austria, since they connected her other main possessions with Dalmatia and ports on the Adriatic.

**938. Difficulties of the Young Turks.** The Young Turks encountered ever-increasing difficulties. They naturally thought that it would be a wise thing to deprive the unruly populations of Albania and Macedonia of their arms. This led to a vast amount of trouble. The Albanians had always been willing to fight for the Turks, but on their own terms, and they showed no inclination to join the regular army or to pay taxes, as the new government wished. So there were successive revolts in Albania and Macedonia, and the disorder under the new constitution was worse than under the old despotism. Then the officials and politicians who liked the old ways of doing things organized a revolt in Constantinople which had to be put down.

**939. War between Italy and Turkey.** In September, 1911, the troubles of the new Turkish government were multiplied, for Italy

declared war on Turkey, on the ground that Italian subjects in Tripoli were not properly treated. All Europe protested against this "high-handed" action by Italy; but Italy replied that she was merely following the example set by other countries—protecting the lives and property of her citizens by annexing a country beset by chronic disorders. Turkey was no match for Italy. There was




FIG. 128. TURKISH PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

A representative parliament in Turkey would naturally have included Armenians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Albanians, and Arabs. But the Young Turk party managed it so that the Turks should rule

not a great deal of fighting, but Italy took possession of such portions of Tripoli as she could hold with her troops and also captured the island of Rhodes. The Young Turks did not feel that they could face the unpopularity of surrendering the regions occupied by Italy; but after the war had dragged on for a year they were forced in October, 1912, by the oncoming of a new Balkan War, to cede Tripoli, reserving only a vague Turkish suzerainty. Italy continued to hold Rhodes too.

940. The First Balkan War (1912). Venizelos, the statesman who had been reorganizing Greece with the ability of a Cavour, se-

cretly arranged an alliance with Bulgaria, Serbia, and little Montenegro for a war with Turkey, which began in October, 1912. The Turkish army proved feeble, and the Bulgarians were able in a few days to defeat it, invest the important fortress of Adrianople, and drive the Turkish forces back close to Constantinople. The Greeks advanced into Macedonia and Thrace, and the Montenegrin and Serbian army defeated the Turkish army sent against them and attacked Albania. (See the map between pages 532-533.)



FIG. 120. TREES FROM WHICH WAR VICTIMS HAVE EATEN THE BARK

Most of the atrocities of the Balkan wars are too horrible even to mention. This grove of trees, on a small island, was stripped of bark by the starving victims imprisoned there without food. Each side seems to have been guilty of cruelty and murder

**941. Austria Intervenes.** Austria now began to get very nervous lest the Serbians should establish themselves on the Adriatic. She forbade Serbia to hold the port of Durazzo. Had Russia been inclined to support Serbia at that moment, the World War would probably have broken out at the end of 1912 instead of two years later. Serbia, however, backed down. A truce was arranged, and representatives of the Balkan states and of Turkey met in London to see if peace could be arranged. The powers advised Turkey to give up everything in Europe except Constantinople and the region



immediately to the west. The Young Turks decided, however, to fight a little longer, and the war was resumed in January. Everything went against them, and in May preliminaries of peace were signed in London in which Turkey turned over Macedonia and Crete to the Balkan allies.

**942. The Second Balkan War (1913) over the Spoils of the First.** But Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece were all jealous of one another, and the division of the booty led immediately to Bulgaria's turning round to wage war on Greece and Serbia. There was a month of frightful war (July, 1913), and then the Bulgarians, defeated on all sides (for even the Turks recovered Adrianople, and the Rumanians invaded Bulgaria from the east), agreed to consider peace, and delegates met in Bucharest, the capital of Rumania.

**943. The Treaty of Bucharest (1913).** The treaties concluded at Bucharest between the Balkan kingdoms disposed of practically all of Turkey's possessions in Europe. The Sultan was left with Constantinople and a small area to the west including the important fortress of Adrianople. The great powers, particularly Austria, insisted that Albania should be made an independent state so as to prevent Serbia from getting a port on the Adriatic. The rest of the former Turkish possessions were divided between Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Montenegro. Greece got the important port of Salonica and the island of Crete as well as a considerable area in Macedonia. Bulgaria was extended to the Ægean Sea on the south. Serbia was nearly doubled in area, and so was Montenegro. (See maps between pages 532-533.)

**944. Revival of Rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia.** The Balkan wars revived all the old bitter rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia and led, as we shall see, to a general European conflict unprecedented in the annals of history. In order to understand the situation the reader should carefully review sections 541 ff. and study the map of Austria-Hungary (p. 302) and the list of races given on page 302. The government at Vienna was largely controlled by the German element in the mixed population of Austria, and it did all it could to keep the Slavic population in Bohemia and Moravia and the Ruthenians of Galicia from gaining



any power in the government. In Hungary the Magyar nobility asserted their supremacy as against the Slovaks and Rumanians within the Hungarian boundary on the north and east and the Slavonians and Croats to the south. Both the Slavs to the north (Czechoslavs) and those to the south (Jugoslavs) bitterly resented the situation, which deprived them of their rightful influence in both Austria and Hungary.

With the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, in 1908, the situation became worse. The neighboring state of Serbia was indignant at this, since the annexed provinces were peopled with South Slavs,<sup>1</sup> and the Serbians had cherished the ambition of uniting with them and the Montenegrins in a new South Slavonic state which would reach from the Danube to the Adriatic. Russia also was angered, but had not yet recovered from the war with Japan and her own revolutions. So, when Germany declared that she would support Austria, in arms if need be, Russia was obliged to submit to the humiliation, as she viewed it, of being unable to protect those of her own race in the Balkans.

**945. Rivalry between Austria and Serbia.** For Serbia, indeed, the annexation of Bosnia by Austria was a serious blow. Serbia was now apparently shut in from the sea for all time to come, and so would be dependent for a market for its farm products upon its enemy across the Danube, Austria-Hungary. This would reduce it to the condition of a weak and somewhat dependent state, which was what Austria wanted.

In the wars of 1912-1913, however, Serbia burst its boundaries on the south and all but reached the Adriatic through Albania. Again Austria interfered and had an independent prince set up in Albania to shut Serbia in. The Serbians felt that the natural rewards of their victories had been denied them by their powerful but jealous neighbor, and bitter hatred resulted.

The situation at the end of the Second Balkan War augured ill for the peace of Europe. Although Austria had managed to frustrate Serbia's hope of getting a port on the Adriatic and had suc-

<sup>1</sup>The South Slavs are mainly Croats, professing the Catholic religion, whereas the Serbs are of the Orthodox Greek Church; but they are of the same race.

ceeded in having Albania made an independent principality under a German prince,<sup>1</sup> Serbia had nearly doubled her territory, and there was every probability that she would speedily undertake to carry out her former plan of uniting the discontented South Slavs in the neighboring provinces of Austria-Hungary—Bosnia, Croatia, and Slavonia. The Russians were in hearty sympathy with this project and ready to lend all possible aid to their distant kinsmen, the South Slavs; all the more so because in a break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire the Tsar might be able to get hold of Constantinople and the outlet to a warm sea.

**946. Pan-German Ambitions; the Bagdad Railroad.** Against this union of the Slavs—*Pan-Slavism*, as it was called—Germany was prepared to put forth all her energies. If Russia dominated the Balkans and took Constantinople, it would put an end to Germany's plans for extending her trade and control in southeastern Europe; above all, it would block the German scheme for a railroad from Berlin to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf. Germany had already arranged for a "concession" from Turkey to construct this road, and it was being rapidly built. Since the trains were to run through Serbian territory, the Serbs themselves began to fear German power more than ever.

In this clash of interests in southeastern Europe, the Germans on their side drew together in a movement known as Pan-Germanism. The idea was to unite all Germans in Germany and in Austria-Hungary to promote their trade and defend their countries. In patriotic circles, therefore, it became the fashion to speak of Pan-Germanism as challenging the threatening hosts of Pan-Slavism.

**947. Feverish Military Preparations in 1913.** The year 1913, following the collision between Austria and Serbia over Albania, brought forth renewed activity in military "preparedness" (§§ 920–921). About the same time both Germany and France made great increases in their armies. Which began first is not certain. Probably they both began about the same time. In any event, Germany added to her standing army in that year, and the Reichstag voted approximately a billion marks for unusual military expenses. France

<sup>1</sup> William of Wied, who was soon driven out by insurrections of the inhabitants.

enlarged her army by extending the period of active service from two to three years. In complete understanding with France, the Russian government made heavy expenditures, and the French commander, General Joffre, was called in to help in reorganizing the Russian army and perfecting plans for a joint war against Germany, should it come. Austria-Hungary gave special attention to strengthening her artillery. Great Britain devoted still larger sums to her navy. Even Belgium introduced universal military service on the assumption that if war came the Germans would try to pass through her territory on the way to France. In short, Europe was like a powder house ready to blow up at any moment.

## VI. OUTBREAK OF THE WORLD WAR

**948. Murder of the Austrian Archduke.** On June 28, 1914, occurred the event which served as a pretext for war. Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, and his wife were assassinated while on a visit to Bosnia. The Serbian government had warned the archduke not to go there, because it feared that hot-headed pro-Serbian conspirators might attempt an assassination. The Austrian government asserted that Serbia had favored such conspiracies in the past and was therefore responsible for the assassination. It allowed nearly a month to pass, however, before making formal protest.

**949. The Austrian Ultimatum (July 23, 1914).** On July 23 Austria sent to Serbia a letter—called an ultimatum—containing a long list of sharp demands. It gave Serbia forty-eight hours in which to promise that she would suppress anti-Austrian propaganda in newspapers, schools, or by secret societies; to dismiss from the army or from government office anyone disliked by Austria; and to give permission for Austrian officials to sit in Serbian courts for the purpose of enforcing these demands and bringing accused persons to justice. Serbia agreed to all these humiliating conditions except the last, and offered to refer that to the Hague Tribunal. But Austria refused to moderate her demands and on July 28 declared war on Serbia.

**950. The Breathless Crisis.** The last week in July, 1914, was one of the most momentous in the history of the world. Was the quarrel between Serbia and Austria to widen into a general war or was it to be confined—"localized"—to the two countries? Over that question the governments of Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia wrestled for many fateful days. Austria took the position that her national honor had been assailed by the Serbs, and that getting justice was a matter for her to decide without outside interference. At the beginning Germany gave Austria a free hand, offering to back her up to the limit. But it was very probable that Russia would not stand idly by and see Serbia crushed by the Austrians. If Russia got involved, it was also likely that her ally, France, would take a hand in the fray. Finally Great Britain, united with Russia and France by secret understandings, had great stakes in the game. Each party was armed to the teeth and afraid the other side would win by striking first.

Before the controversy had advanced very far, Great Britain proposed a general conference to settle the quarrel between Austria and Serbia. Austria refused, on the ground that the quarrel was her affair, and Germany supported Austria in her refusal, proposing instead direct negotiations between Austria and Russia. But both Austria and Russia were stiff-necked about the business and went ahead preparing for war. When at length it looked as if the dreadful conflict was at hand, Germany at the eleventh hour urged Austria to moderate her tone and come to terms with Russia. But then it was too late. Russia had already begun a general mobilization of her troops—an action which meant war on Austria and Germany, according to the understanding of military men.

**951. Germany violates Belgian Neutrality.** Hearing of Russian mobilization, Germany called upon the Tsar to stop it and receiving no reply declared war on Russia, August 1. On the same day she demanded of France, Russia's ally, a report as to what she proposed to do. The French government replied that France would take such action as her interests might require; whereupon Germany declared war on France on August 3.

Knowing that Germany and Austria were greatly outnumbered



by the Russians and the French, the German war council decided that speed was the great element in victory. On August 2 German troops occupied the neutral country of Luxemburg, in spite of the protests of its ruler. Germany then issued an ultimatum to Belgium, giving the government twelve hours, from 7 P.M. to 7 A.M., to decide whether it would permit the German troops to cross the kingdom on their way to France. If Belgium consented, Germany promised to respect her territory and people; if she refused, Germany would treat her as an enemy. With great firmness and dignity Belgium made her historic reply. She declared that her neutrality had been decreed and guaranteed by the powers, including Prussia, and that she would resist to the bitter end any attempt to violate it.

**952. Great Britain enters the War.** In all the anxious negotiations that had followed the murder of the Austrian archduke and his wife England had been very active. In the midst of the "conversations" the British government had suggested a conference to settle Austria's quarrel with Serbia, only to have the plan rejected, as we have seen. To the German suggestion that direct negotiations be opened between Austria and Russia, England had consented, only to be defeated by the bad temper of those two governments.

When war knocked at the very doors, Germany turned to England to find out what attitude she would take. On August 1 the German ambassador asked the British government whether it would remain neutral if Germany promised not to violate Belgian territory. He also urged the British to state the terms on which they would stay out of the war, suggesting that Germany might be willing to guarantee the integrity of France and her colonies; but all such proposals were rejected by the British government. Furthermore, on August 2, before Belgium had been invaded, the British cabinet informed France that she could count on the protection of the British fleet if the German fleet came into the North Sea or the Channel to undertake hostile action.

Two days later, learning that German troops were making their way into Belgium, the British foreign minister, Sir Edward Grey, sent an ultimatum to Germany demanding assurances within twelve

hours that she would respect Belgian neutrality. The German chancellor replied that military necessity required that the German army should cross Belgium. In a conversation with the British ambassador he referred to the treaty guaranteeing Belgian neutrality as "a mere scrap of paper" compared with the horrors of a war between Great Britain and Germany. No matter what the German chancellor said about it, the invasion of little Belgium aroused great anger all over the world and put the British people solidly behind their government when, on August 4, it declared war on Germany.

**953. The Powers at War (1914).** Japan speedily declared war on Germany, and early in November Turkey decided to join the Central Powers. So within three months Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey were pitted against Serbia, Russia, France, Belgium, Great Britain, Montenegro, and Japan. Italy declared herself neutral and not bound to help Austria and Germany, since in the Triple Alliance of 1882 she had pledged her aid only in case they were attacked; she considered that they were now the aggressors and that consequently she was free to keep out of the struggle.

**954. The British View of the War.** In regard to England's responsibility for taking part in the war the *London Times* observed, December 5, 1914: "If the British government had made the declaration to the Russians [which the Germans desired] it would have meant simply that England declared for Germany and Austria against Russia. But according to that argument all of the great powers at war are equally responsible because they did not do something different from what they did do. France, for instance, could have prevented the war if she had declined to support Russia; Russia could have prevented it if she had taken no interest in the fate of Serbia; and finally Germany could have prevented it if she had refused to support Austria; while, as for Austria, she could have prevented it if she had never presented her ultimatum [to Serbia]."

**955. The German View of the War.** In defense of their position the Germans also worked up a theory of how the war came about. Perhaps it is best stated in the language of the German chancellor in a speech delivered on September 5, 1917: "Germany

was obliged to enter a most serious struggle for the defense of her existence because she was threatened by her neighbors, France and Russia, who were eager for booty and power, who were bent on destroying her, and who were urged on by the Island Empire [Great Britain]." At all events that was the official theory on which the German people were summoned to arms in a struggle destined to bring crushing defeat to their country.

### QUESTIONS

I. Explain the danger that arises from thinking of nations as persons. How long have European peoples been engaged in warfare? How did France start conscription for her armies? Under what circumstances did Prussia build up her army? Explain the spread of militarism. Show how all the great powers practiced it. Why was Great Britain content with naval supremacy? On what ground did Germany justify her navy?

II. What were the Hague conferences? State the results. Did they do anything to retard militarism? What kind of "peace treaties" were signed by the leading countries? How was socialism an "international" force?

III. Define "imperialism." How does imperialism start? How does it usually end? Review some of the steps in European imperialism. State the "historic grudges" which the various European countries cherished. What was the Triple Alliance? How were France and Russia bound together? Explain England's system of "understandings." Trace the history of the Moroccan crisis.

IV. What interests had Russia and Austria in the Balkans? How did the Balkan wars of 1912-1913 affect Germany, France, and Russia?

V. Give a short account of the Turkish revolution of 1908. In what way did Austria take advantage of the situation in Turkey in 1908? Mention some of the difficulties which confronted the Young Turks. What reason did Italy give for making war on Turkey? What was the outcome of the war? Outline the history of the Balkan wars from the formation of the Balkan alliance to the Treaty of Bucharest. What difficulties did Austria's annexation of Bosnia raise?

VI. What was the "political" reason for the murder of the Austrian archduke? What grounds did Austria have for making severe demands upon Serbia? What were the demands? What was meant by attempts to "localize" the quarrel? What was the attitude of Germany? of Russia? How did all the powers become involved in it? How did the

conduct of Austria and Russia make peaceful settlement impossible? What was the meaning of the Russian mobilization? On what grounds did Germany violate Belgian neutrality? What were England's reasons for entering the war? By November, 1914, what countries were at war? Give the English and German views of the war.

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II: (1) the peace movement and international rivalry, pp. 679-691; (2) German foreign policies, 1871-1890, pp. 691-697; (3) the balance of power and diplomatic crises, 1890-1914, pp. 697-710; (4) the Balkan wars, 1912-1913, pp. 528-539; SCHAPIRO, *Modern and Contemporary European History*: (5) half a century of international relations, pp. 684-693; (6) the peace movement, pp. 693-699; (7) disturbing factors in European diplomacy, pp. 700-708; (8) origins of the World War, pp. 709-722.



## CHAPTER XXIX

### FIRST YEARS OF THE WORLD WAR (1914-1916)

#### I. COURSE OF THE WAR IN 1914 AND 1915

**956. The German Drive on Paris Checked.** The vast German army advanced on France in three divisions: one through Belgium, one through Luxemburg (also a neutral state) down into Cham-



© Harris & Ewing

FIG. 130. KING ALBERT

pagne, and the third from Metz toward Nancy. The Belgians offered a determined resistance to the advance of the northern division and hindered it for ten days—a delay of vital importance to the French. But the heavy German guns proved too much for the forts round Liège, which were soon battered to pieces, and Brussels was occupied by the enemy August 20. The German forces advancing up the Meuse met with no serious opposition. The French, reënforced by British troops hastily dispatched across the channel, made their first stand round Namur. This famous for-

trass, however, immediately collapsed under the fire from German siege guns, and the French and British rapidly retreated southward. The Germans had come within twenty-five miles of Paris by September 1. The French government fled to Bordeaux, and the capital prepared for a siege.

**957. Battle of the Marne, September, 1914.** South of the Marne the French general Joffre halted his retreating forces, added to them a fresh army (which had been quietly collected around Paris and rushed to his support), and made an attack on the Germans. This famous battle of the Marne put an end to the danger that threatened Paris, and Joffre became the idol of his country,



FIG. 131. RUINS OF THE PRINCIPAL STREET OF LOUVAIN AFTER IT WAS BOMBARDED BY THE GERMANS

which bestowed on him the baton of a marshal of France in recognition of his services to her. The Germans, under Von Kluck, were now compelled to retreat to a line of hills running from Soissons to Reims. There they intrenched themselves before the French and British could drive them farther back.


**958. Conquest and Ill-treatment of Belgium.** After the Germans had given up their hope of surprising Paris, they proceeded to overrun Belgium. They captured Antwerp on October 10 and conquered the whole country except a tiny corner southwest of

Ostend. It was their hope to push on to Calais and occupy this port nearest to England as a base of attack against the British Isles, but they were checked at the Yser River. They treated the Belgians as a conquered people, exacting huge tributes, partly burned the city of Louvain, executed many citizens, and seized any machinery or supplies that they desired. This treatment of a peaceful little neighbor, whose safety from invasion they themselves had solemnly guaranteed, when the kingdom of Belgium was formed, did more to rouse the anger of the rest of the world than any other act of the German government.

**959. The German Occupation of Northeastern France.** The southernmost of the German armies, and the only one which had ventured to advance directly on France without taking the unfair advantage of a neutral boundary line, was at first unable to make much headway. But before long it succeeded in establishing its troops in French territory just east of the Meuse on a line running east of Verdun and St. Dié (see map, p. 549). The French, however, invaded southern Alsace and occupied a little German territory there. Thus the first three months of the war saw the Germans in practically complete possession of Belgium and Luxemburg, together with a broad strip of northeastern France filled with prosperous manufacturing towns, farms and vineyards, and invaluable coal and iron mines.

**960. Permanence of the Battle Line in France.** The lines established after the battle of the Marne and the check on the Yser did not change greatly in four years, in spite of the constant fighting and the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of men on both sides. The Germans were not able to push very much farther into France, and the Allied forces were almost equally unsuccessful in their repeated attempts, at terrible sacrifice of life, to force the Germans back into their own country. Both sides "dug themselves in," and trench warfare went on almost incessantly, with the aid of machine guns, shells, and huge cannon. Airplanes flew hither and thither, observing the enemy's positions and operations and dropping bombs in his midst. Poisonous gases and liquid fire, used on both sides, added their horrors to the situation.





THE WESTERN FRONT, 1914-1917





- Germany, Austria-Hungary, and their Allies
- Countries at War with Teutonic Allies

THE EASTERN FRONT, 1914-1917

**961. The War on the East Front (1914-1915).** On the Eastern Front the Russians at first advanced far more rapidly than had been expected. They succeeded in invading East Prussia, but were soon driven out by Hindenburg and his army. They made their main attack on the Austrians in Galicia, but were forced to withdraw, because of the operations of the German and Austrian armies in Poland. These had combined in a drive on Warsaw and thus threatened the Russians on the north. During the winter of 1915 the Russians made fierce attempts to pass the Carpathians and invade Austria-Hungary. They failed, however, on account of lack of supplies, and hundreds of thousands of lives were sacrificed in vain. In August, 1915, Russia was forced to surrender Warsaw and other large Polish towns to the Germans, who then pushed on beyond Poland and occupied Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia.

**962. Turkey joins the Central Powers, November, 1914.** In November, 1914, the Teutonic allies were reënforced by Turkey. The Sultan issued a call to all faithful Mohammedans to wage a Holy War on the "enemies of Islam." But, contrary to the hopes of Germany, there was no general rising of the Mohammedans in India and Egypt against the British rule. Nor were the plans announced for capturing the Suez Canal carried out. England seized the opportunity to declare Egypt altogether independent of Turkey (December, 1914) and established a new ruler, who was given the title of "Sultan of Egypt" and accepted a British protectorate over his country. The British also invaded Mesopotamia and later Syria, and finally captured the famous old city of Bagdad, in March, 1917, and then the holy city of Jerusalem, in December, 1917.

**963. The Gallipoli Disaster.** But an attempt of the British and French in 1915 to take Constantinople proved a terrible failure. In April of that year their forces, greatly strengthened by contingents from Australia and New Zealand, who had come to the Mediterranean by way of the Red Sea, tried to force their way up the Dardanelles. The Turks, well supplied with German commanders and equipment, defended themselves with such success that the Allies, in spite of the sacrifice of a hundred thousand men killed and

wounded, were unable to hold their positions on the peninsula of Gallipoli, where they had secured a footing. After some months the British government was obliged to recognize that it had made a tragic mistake, and the attempt was given up.

**964. The Belligerents at the Opening of the Second Year of the War.** In May, 1915, Italy decided to declare war on Austria-Hungary, and in August, 1916, on Germany as well. Her people had no love for Austria. On the contrary, they wanted to win "Italia Irredenta"—those portions of the Italian people still unredeemed from Austrian rule, who lived around Trent, in Istria and the great seaport of Trieste, and along the Dalmatian coast. So this added another "front" which the Central Powers had to defend.

Accordingly the line-up at the opening of the second year of the war consisted of the Central Powers—Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey—opposed to Russia, France, Italy, Great Britain (including Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, South Africans, and East Indian troops, all ready to shed their blood in the cause of the British Empire), Belgium, Serbia, Japan, and the tiny countries of Montenegro and San Marino: twelve belligerents in all, scattered over the whole globe. But the war was not destined to stop at this point. Hundreds of millions of people at that time neutral later took up arms against the Central Powers.

**965. Loss of the German Colonies.** The war early began to show an irresistible tendency to envelop the whole world. Japan quickly captured the German port of Kiaochow and took possession of the German stations in the northern Pacific, while the Australians and New Zealanders captured those in the southern Pacific. Troops from the South African Union, with the hearty coöperation of the Boers, Britain's late enemies, occupied German Southwest Africa. The remaining German colonies, Togoland, Cameroons, and German East Africa, gradually fell into the hands of the British or French. So although Germany was able, as we shall see, to conquer important portions of central Europe as the war proceeded, she lost all her colonies. The question whether she should have them back or have any indemnity for them was one of the great problems developed by the war.



## II. THE WAR ON THE SEA

**966. Extinction of German Commerce.** It was the war on the sea that raised the chief problems for the world at large. At the beginning of the war many people supposed that there would soon be a great and perhaps decisive naval engagement between the German and British fleets, but no such thing happened.<sup>1</sup> The Germans kept their dreadnaughts safe in their harbors, protected by cruisers and mines. The German merchant ships took shelter at home or in neutral ports, and the few cruisers that remained at large for a time scouring the seas and destroying British vessels were captured or sunk. Hence German commerce was soon cut off altogether, and Britain ruled the ocean. Had it not been for the recently discovered and rapidly improved submarines, or U-boats, as they were popularly called, the Germans would have been helpless against the British control of the seas. It was this new kind of warfare that largely determined the course of the conflict of the nations.

**967. The Blockade and the Submarine.** If it had not been for the submarine, England could have blockaded the German ports without violating the established principles of international law. But the German submarines could still steal out and sink British merchant ships and manage now and then to torpedo a great war vessel. Under these new conditions of naval warfare Great Britain simply ordered all neutral ships bound for the neutral ports of Holland, Norway, and Sweden to stop and be inspected at Kirkwall in the Orkney Islands, to see whether they were carrying contraband of war—namely, munitions and materials to be used directly or indirectly for military ends—or whether their cargoes were not really destined for Germany. When, on February 1, 1915, the German government ordered the confiscation of all grain in private

<sup>1</sup>On May 31, 1916, a portion of the German fleet ventured out of the Baltic and fell in with a strong detachment of the British fleet. After a few hours the mist, smoke, and darkness put an end to the fight. The Germans claimed a victory; but the fact that their ships retired to a fortified base from which no one of them came forth again until the entire fleet came out to surrender to the British fleet, without having fired a single shot, makes it difficult to see how they could call the outcome of this engagement a "victory."



hands, with a view to keeping its great armies well fed, England declared that thereafter all shipments of foodstuffs to Germany would be deemed absolute contraband of war—that is, liable to seizure at sea—since feeding her fighting men was even more necessary than supplying them with munitions.

**968. The Germans extend the Zone of Marine War.** This was regarded by the Germans as an obvious attempt “through starvation to doom an entire nation to destruction.” The German government thereupon declared that the waters around England should be regarded as within the zone of war, and that within this zone all enemy merchant vessels would be sunk, whether it was possible to save the passengers and crews or not. Neutrals were warned that they would be in great danger if they entered the zone. In former days it was possible for a man-of-war to hold up a vessel and, if the cargo was found to be contraband, to capture or sink the vessel after taking off the people on board; but the submarine had no room for extra persons, and the Germans often found it more convenient to torpedo vessels without even the warning necessary to enable the passengers and crew to take to the lifeboats.

**969. The Sinking of the *Lusitania*.** In February, 1915, German submarines began to sink not only enemy vessels but neutral ones as well, sometimes giving the people on board warning, but often not. The most terrible example of the ruthlessness of the U-boats was the sinking, without warning, of the British liner *Lusitania* on May 7, 1915, involving the loss of nearly twelve hundred men, women, and children, including over a hundred American citizens. Among the Germans this was hailed as a heroic deed. They claimed that the vessel was armed and laden with shells, and that the Americans had no business to be on it, since a notice in the New York papers had warned them against traveling on the fated boat. But a great many American people were horrified by the deed, and President Wilson took the ground that it was a clear violation of neutral rights.<sup>1</sup> With firmness he insisted that Ger-

<sup>1</sup>The questions of the rights of neutrals, of contraband, and the rights of search are very complicated, and only the main issues in the long and heated discussions can be suggested here.

many must make all possible amends and promise not to repeat such tactics. For several months the relations between the United States and Germany were strained almost to the breaking-point.

### III. THE CAMPAIGNS OF 1916

**970. The British Drive (1915).** On the Western Front the British forces had steadily increased until by the end of September, 1915, Sir John French had a million men under his command. The British had also been very busy producing arms and munitions of war, in which they were sadly deficient at the opening of the conflict, and they had greatly added to their supplies by purchases in the United States. They therefore resolved upon a drive northeast of Arras. After a period of terrific fighting they succeeded in forcing back the German lines two or three miles on a front of fifteen or twenty miles. This gave the world some notion of the difficulty the Allies would have to meet in their attempt to oust the German armies from France and Belgium.

**971. The Balkan Situation.** In spite of the British drive, the Germans, who had succeeded in forcing back the Russians in Galicia, now undertook the invasion of Serbia. This encouraged Serbia's bitter enemy, Bulgaria, to declare in favor of the Central Powers and join vigorously in the punishment of her neighbor. In spite of heroic resistance on the part of the Serbians, their country, attacked on two sides, quickly fell into the hands of their enemies. From this time on they were able to regain very little of their lost territory.

**972. The Policy of Greece.** In this turmoil the neighboring country, Greece, had great difficulty in deciding what to do. If she joined Germany, the British and French fleets in the Mediterranean could attack her from the sea; if she joined the *Entente* Allies, then the Germans and Bulgarians might overrun her territory from the north. For a long time the king, Constantine, who was said to be pro-German in his sympathies, tried to keep out of the fight, but in May, 1917, he was forced from the throne by the British and French. Then under the leadership of an anti-German

minister, Venizelos, Greece was taken into the war with the Allies against the Central Powers.

**973. The Attempt to break through at Verdun.** After the small success of the British drive at the end of 1915 the Germans resolved to show what they could do on the Western Front. They decided to attack the ancient fortress of Verdun. The loss of this fortress, which was popularly regarded as one of the country's chief strongholds, would greatly discourage the French. The fact that Metz, a very important center of German supplies, lay not far east of Verdun served to increase the German chances for breaking through the French lines at this point. Great masses of troops, under the general command of no less a personage than the German crown prince, were brought together, and on February 21, 1916, the attack began.

For a time the French lines gave way, and those throughout the world who favored the Allies held their breath, for it seemed as if the Germans were about to crush the French defense and again threaten Paris. But the French recovered and held their own once more. The British troops were now numerous enough to hold the lines to the north. A series of terrible encounters followed, but the French under General Joffre were able during May and June to push the Germans back from the positions occupied in the first onrush. By July all danger of a German victory at that point seemed to be over. It was a great source of satisfaction to the Allies and their sympathizers to behold the crown prince repulsed after a supreme effort to distinguish himself in the longest and bloodiest of all the fearful combats that had yet occurred.

**974. Conscription in England.** At the opening of the war England had an available force of less than two hundred thousand men, "a contemptible army," as the kaiser is reported to have scornfully denominated it. Germany, Russia, and France had their millions of trained men, owing to their long-established system of universal military service,—conscription, as it is called,—which makes every able-bodied man liable to service (§§ 920-921). For a time England tried to increase its army by voluntary enlistments, and on the whole succeeded very well. But after much discussion and

opposition she introduced (May, 1916) a system of universal compulsory military service, which included all able-bodied men between the ages of eighteen and forty-one (the limits were extended later to include men from eighteen to fifty years of age, with restricted service also for those between fifty and fifty-five).

**975. The Great Battle of the Somme.** Shortly afterward, the long-talked-of Anglo-French drive, the battle of the Somme, began




FIG. 132. A TANK

and went on for four months—from July to November, 1916—east and northeast of Amiens. Here a new British military invention made its first appearance, the so-called “tanks”—huge armored motor cars so built as to break through barbed-wire entanglements and crawl over great holes and trenches. The British had also their fifteen-inch mortars for hurling big shells. The Germans retreated a few miles, and their confidence in their ability to hold out was shaken, but the cost in killed and wounded was terrible.

**976. Drives in the Southeast.** While the battle of Verdun was raging, the Italians, who had made but little progress against the



strong Austrian fortifications, were suddenly pushed back by a great Austrian drive in May, 1916. By the middle of June they had not only lost the little they had gained but were forced to evacuate some of their own territory. At this point the Russians, in spite of the loss of Poland, attacked Austria once more and again threatened to press into Hungary. So Austria had to give way in Italy in order to defend her Galician boundary, and the Italians were able not only to regain what they had lost but to advance somewhat on their way, as they hoped, to Trieste.

**977. Rumania Overrun.** Though the Russians had sacrificed more than a million men, and because of treachery in the government found it impossible to hold their conquests, their momentary success encouraged Rumania to join in the war on the side of the Allies, who seemed to be getting the better of the Central Powers. She invaded Transylvania, which she had long claimed as properly hers. The Germans, notwithstanding the pressure on the Somme, immediately sent two of their best generals and, with the help of the Bulgarians, attacked Rumania from the west and south and captured Bucharest, the capital, in December, 1916. About two thirds of Rumania was soon in possession of her enemies, and the Germans could supplement their supplies from her rich fields of grain and abundant oil wells.

**978. Aërial Warfare.** For the first time in the history of war men were able to fly high above the contending forces, making observations and engaging in aërial battles. Airplanes are now among the essentials of war, and they bring new horrors in their train. The Germans made repeated air raids on England, hoping to intimidate the people. They first used the huge dirigible balloons called Zeppelins, but these were later replaced by airplanes of various kinds. They killed two or three thousand English civilians in town and country and destroyed some property. Without accomplishing any important military aims, they increased their reputation among the English for needless cruelty and led the English to follow a similar policy for the safety of their unfortified towns. British and French airmen dropped bombs on the more accessible German towns—Freiburg, Karlsruhe, and Mannheim—and many military places.

#### IV. THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD WAR

**979. Opinion in the United States.** Early in the year 1917 Germany's submarine policy and reckless sinking of neutral ships finally involved her in war with a new antagonist, the great and powerful republic across the Atlantic. The government of the United States had been very patient and long-suffering. When the war broke out, President Wilson declared that the government would observe strict neutrality, and he urged American citizens to avoid taking sides in a conflict that did not directly concern them. But it was impossible to remain indifferent when such tremendous events were being reported day by day. The German newspapers in the United States eagerly defended the Central Powers and laid the responsibility for the war at England's door. On the other hand, many British subjects in America from England and Canada did all they could to convince the people that Germany was the real offender and guilty of all kinds of crimes besides. No doubt a great body of Americans were deeply shocked by the German invasion of Belgium, the burning of Belgian towns, and the sinking of merchant ships by submarines. Those of English descent naturally felt themselves drawn to England in her struggle for existence. Those of democratic sympathies disliked the arrogant talk of the kaiser about God and himself, and hoped that the military party which ruled Germany would be overthrown in the war.

**980. Activities of Foreign Agents.** The bitter feelings already roused by the war were increased by the activities of foreign spies and agents of one kind or another. Germany had a number of representatives in the United States denouncing England and the *Entente* Allies and doing all they could to stir up enmity toward them.<sup>1</sup> Very early in the war the minister of Austria-Hungary had

<sup>1</sup>There was a very bitter difference of feeling between the pro-Germans and the friends of the Allies in regard to the exportation of arms and munitions. Since Germany had no way of getting supplies from the United States, owing to the British control of the Atlantic, she maintained that it was *unneutral* for the manufacturers in the United States to sell arms to the Allies. Yet it has always been considered the right of neutrals to sell to any belligerent anything they are in a position to furnish. When the Germans succeeded in getting a freight submarine, the *Deutschland*, over to New London, Connecticut, the captain found people willing enough to sell war supplies to Germans.

to be sent home for concocting a scheme for doing damage to the great steel mills which were supplying England and France with arms and munitions. At the same time, England also had her full quota of agents working up sentiment on the other side. Thus many Americans were utterly bewildered by the clamor spread abroad by propaganda.

**191. American Protests against Submarine Methods.** As time went on President Wilson dispatched note after note to Germany protesting against the merciless and indiscriminate manner in which the submarines sent vessels to the bottom—not only British ships, like the *Lusitania*, carrying American passengers, but American ships and those of other neutral nations. There was often no warning until the torpedo actually struck the ship, and frequently passengers were not given enough time to get safely into the life-boats. The anger of the American people in general against Germany became hotter and hotter, and President Wilson began to be denounced for tolerating any diplomatic relations with the German imperial government, even though the Germans promised to reform their submarine policy in September, 1916.

**192. The German Peace Proposal (1916).** President Wilson, however, refused to be driven from his position. He informed Germany, it is true, that he would omit no word or act in resisting her lawless submarine policy, but he steadfastly sought ways of peace; and for a time it appeared to some as if peace might come, as he said, "without victory." In December, 1916, after the Central Powers had occupied Poland, Serbia, and Rumania, and Germany seemed to be victorious on all sides, she made what she called a peace offer. She proposed that the belligerents send representatives to some point in a neutral country to consider the terms of settlement. The German government must have known well enough that the Allies could not possibly consider making peace at a time when their enemies were at the height of military success. The proposition was scornfully rejected, but in German eyes it served to throw the burden for continuing the fearful conflict upon the Allies. Whoever might have been responsible for beginning the war, Germany now said that she had been the first to propose to end it. The kaiser

proclaimed exultantly that the Allies had at last cast off the mask of hypocrisy and plainly revealed their "lust of conquest." The refusal of her adversaries to consider peace also furnished an excuse for a resort to the unrestricted submarine warfare which Germany was contemplating. She argued that if her enemies really proposed to "crush" her, no means of self-defense on her part could be too ruthless.

**983. President Wilson's Efforts for Peace.** Before the Allies had replied to the German peace suggestion President Wilson intervened (December 18) with a note sent to all the belligerents, calling attention to the fact that both sides seemed to agree that there should be a league for maintaining peace and that small states should be protected, but saying that neither side had stated the "concrete objects" for which it was fighting. He accordingly suggested a conference to discuss the essential conditions of peace. Germany expressed herself as ready for a meeting of delegates to consider peace terms. The Allies, however, declined to negotiate, but went so far in replying to President Wilson (January 10, 1917) as to give a definition of the oft-used terms "restoration," "restitution," and "guarantees" and to lay down conditions of peace which the Germans rejected as "intolerable."

Not discouraged by the failure to bring the belligerents together, President Wilson in an address on January 22, 1917, stated his view of the essentials of peace. He said that peace must, among other things, provide for equality of right for both great and small nations, security for subject "peoples," direct outlet to the sea for every great people, "freedom of the seas,"<sup>1</sup> and limitation of armaments. "No peace can last," he declared, "or ought to last,

<sup>1</sup>In time of peace the high seas—that is, the ocean outside the three-mile limit drawn along the coast—are free to all and are not supposed to be under the control of any particular government. It is in time of war that the question of the "freedom of the seas" arises. England was in a position at the opening of the war to cut off Germany's maritime commerce. Germany immediately established vast barred zones, in which she sank not only her enemies' vessels but those of neutrals which ventured to neglect her warnings. So the ocean was anything but free during the conflict. Another element in the freedom of the seas is the control of such narrow passages as the Dardanelles, the Strait of Gibraltar, the Suez and Panama canals, and the entrance to the Baltic. It is hard to imagine any arrangement that will keep the seas open and safe so long as wars continue to take place among maritime powers.



which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

"There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armaments are henceforth to continue here and there to be built up and maintained. The statesmen of the world must plan for peace, and nations must adjust and accommodate their policy to it as they have planned for war and made ready for pitiless contest and rivalry."

But all these peace negotiations came to naught; the war went on, and the United States was speedily drawn into the awful conflict.

### QUESTIONS

I. What led Germany to attack Belgium? Trace the advance of the German armies into France. Describe Germany's treatment of Belgium during her occupation of the country. Give some account of the course of the fighting on the Eastern Front. What was the policy of the *Entente* in regard to Turkey?

II. What policy did England and Germany adopt in marine warfare? What effect did this have on the commerce of neutrals? Compare the situation with that during the Napoleonic wars. What was the policy of the Balkan states?

III. Why did the Germans undertake the drive at Verdun and what was the outcome? Describe the battle of the Somme. What importance had aircraft in the war?

IV. What was the attitude of the people of the United States toward the war? What differences of opinion existed? What problems had the government to face? Sketch the policy of President Wilson.

### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

**Supplementary.** HAYES, *A Brief History of the World War*: (1) general causes of the war, pp. 1-7; (2) Germany's responsibility, pp. 7-20; (3) the German conquest of Belgium, pp. 21-40; (4) early phases of the war in the East, pp. 41-57; (5) German victories in the East, pp. 80-142; (6) the campaigns of 1916, pp. 143-200; (7) American efforts to bring about peace, pp. 201-213.

## CHAPTER XXX

### FINAL STAGES OF THE WAR; THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

#### I. ENTRANCE OF THE UNITED STATES INTO THE WAR

**984. Renewed Submarine War (February, 1917).** At the very moment when the German government was exhibiting an apparent interest in President Wilson's efforts to bring about peace the German military leaders were planning a new and still more ruthless use of their submarines than they had hitherto made.

In January, 1917, England, in order completely to cut off supplies from Germany, extended the area which she declared to be in a state of blockade. Germany then proclaimed to the world that in order to make head against "British tyranny" and England's alleged plan to starve Germany she proposed to establish a vast barred zone extending far to the west of Great Britain, in which sea traffic with England would be prevented by every available means. In this way she flattered herself that England, drawing much of her food from distant regions, would soon be reduced to starvation and the war brought to a speedy end. One of the most irritating features of Germany's plan was that a narrow lane was to be left through which the United States was to be permitted to send one ship a week, provided it was painted with bright stripes of color and carried no contraband. By these measures Germany reserved a vast area of the high seas for her submarine enterprises, utterly regardless of every historic right of neutral nations (see map on next page).

**985. American Relations with Germany Severed.** On February 1, 1917, the Germans opened their unrestricted submarine warfare in this great barred zone, and many vessels were sunk. President Wilson broke off diplomatic relations with the German government on February 3, and Count von Bernstorff was sent

home, to the great relief of those who had criticized the President for being too patient. The sinkings went on, and popular opinion was more and more aroused against Germany. The hostility was



GERMAN WAR ZONE OF FEBRUARY 1, 1917

Late in the year 1917 and early in 1918 the German government extended the barred zone so as to include the islands off the coast of Africa, Madeira, the Cape Verde Islands, and the Azores, in order to cut the routes between Europe and South America

intensified by the publication of a letter from the German minister of foreign affairs to the Mexican government, which proposed that if war broke out between the United States and Germany, Mexico should attack the United States and should take Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona as its reward.

**986. The United States declares War on Germany, April 6, 1917.** It was finally evident that war was unavoidable. President Wilson summoned a special session of Congress, and on April 2, 1917, read a memorable address to its members in which he said that Germany had to all intents and purposes declared war on the United States. "Our object," he maintained, "is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world, as against selfish and autocratic power." The free and self-governed peoples of the world must combine, he urged, "to make the world safe for democracy," for otherwise no permanent peace was possible. He proposed that the United States should fight side by side with Germany's enemies and aid them with liberal loans. Both Houses of Congress approved by large majorities the proposed resolution that the United States had been forced into war. Provisions were made for borrowing vast sums; old forms of taxation were greatly increased and many new ones were added. In May, 1917, conscription was introduced, and all able-bodied men between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one were declared liable to military service. Preparations were made for training great bodies of troops to be sent across the Atlantic to aid the cause of the Allies and measures were taken for building ships to replace those destroyed by German submarines. The people of the United States showed themselves eager to do their part in the war on "autocracy and militarism."<sup>1</sup>

## II. THE WORLD AT WAR

**987. Increase of Belligerents.** One result of the entrance of the United States into the war was a great increase in the number of Germany's enemies during the year 1917. Cuba and Panama immediately followed the example set by the great North American republic; Greece, after much internal turmoil and dissension,

<sup>1</sup> When the unrestricted submarine sinkings began (February 1, 1917), the German newspapers informed their readers that England would speedily be brought to her knees. But while hundreds of ships were sunk, thousands came and went from English ports, managing in various ways to escape the U-boats. Then by economy, raising more food, and building more ships, England, with America's help, successfully offset the damage done by the Germans.



finally, under the leadership of Venizelos, joined the Allies; in the latter half of the year Siam, Liberia, China, and Brazil proclaimed war on Germany. The war had become literally a world conflict. The governments of nearly a billion and a half of the earth's population were involved in the amazing struggle. Thirteen hundred and forty millions of people were committed by their rulers to the side of the Allies, and the countries included in the Central European alliance had a total population of about one hundred and sixty millions. Thus nearly seven eighths of the population of the globe were nominally at war, and nine tenths of these were arrayed against one tenth, led by Prussia. Of course the vast populations of India and China helped to swell these figures but took little or no part in the active prosecution of the war. And after the Russian revolution had destroyed the old government, Russia, with its millions of inhabitants, could by the end of 1917 no longer be reckoned an active factor. Keeping these facts in mind, the tables on pages 567 and 568 will make the situation clear.

**988. The Neutral Nations.** As for the countries which remained neutral, they included a population of perhaps one hundred and ninety millions. Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden were far too close to Germany to risk breaking with her, although it would seem that many of their people disapproved her conduct. Spain and a number of Latin-American states, including Mexico and Chile, held aloof. But no country could escape the burdens and afflictions of a war of such magnitude. Real neutrality was almost impossible. Everywhere taxes and prices rose, essential supplies were cut off, and business was greatly dislocated.

**989. The Western Front in 1917.** In addition to the increase in Germany's enemies the chief military events of 1917 were the following: In March the Germans decided to shorten their lines on the Western Front from Noyon on the south to Arras on the north. They withdrew, devastating the land as they went, and the French and British were able to reoccupy about one eighth of the French territory that the enemy had held so long. The Germans were disturbed by fierce attacks while establishing their new line of defense, but in spite of great sacrifices on the part of the French and British,

and particularly of the Canadians, who fought with special heroism, this "Hindenburg" line was so well fortified that it held, and with slight exceptions continued to hold during the year. The British made some progress in forcing back the enemy on the Belgian coast, with the hope of gaining Zeebrugge, the base from which German submarines made their departure to prey on British

THE WORLD WAR AT THE OPENING OF 1918  
THE ALLIES AND THEIR COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES

| COUNTRY             | DATE OF ENTRANCE | POPULATION    | MEN UNDER ARMS <sup>1</sup> |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
|                     | <i>1914</i>      |               |                             |
| Serbia . . . . .    | July 28          | 4,550,000     | 300,000                     |
| Russia . . . . .    | August 1         | 175,000,000   | 9,000,000 <sup>2</sup>      |
| France . . . . .    | August 3         | 87,500,000    | 6,000,000                   |
| Belgium . . . . .   | August 4         | 22,500,000    | 300,000                     |
| British Empire . .  | August 4         | 440,000,000   | 5,000,000                   |
| Montenegro . . . .  | August 7         | 516,000       | 40,000                      |
| Japan . . . . .     | August 23        | 74,000,000    | 1,400,000                   |
|                     | <i>1915</i>      |               |                             |
| Italy . . . . .     | May 23           | 37,000,000    | 3,000,000                   |
| San Marino . . . .  | June 2           | 12,000        | 1,000                       |
|                     | <i>1916</i>      |               |                             |
| Portugal . . . . .  | March 10         | 15,000,000    | 200,000                     |
| Rumania . . . . .   | August 27        | 7,500,000     | 320,000                     |
|                     | <i>1917</i>      |               |                             |
| United States . . . | April 6          | 113,000,000   | 1,000,000 (?)               |
| Cuba . . . . .      | April 8          | 2,500,000     | 11,000                      |
| Panama . . . . .    | April 9          | 427,000       |                             |
| Greece . . . . .    | July 16          | 5,000,000     | 300,000                     |
| Siam . . . . .      | July 22          | 8,150,000     | 36,000                      |
| Liberia . . . . .   | August 7         | 1,800,000     | 400                         |
| China . . . . .     | August 14        | 320,000,000   | 540,000                     |
| Brazil . . . . .    | October 26       | 25,000,000    | 25,000                      |
|                     |                  | 1,339,455,000 | 27,473,400                  |

<sup>1</sup>The population is only approximate and in round numbers. The strength of the armies given is based on an estimate of the United States War Department, October, 1917.

<sup>2</sup>The Russian armies at the end of 1917 were in a state of complete dissolution.

CENTRAL POWERS, INCLUDING COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES  
AT THE OPENING OF THE WAR

| COUNTRY                   | DATE OF ENTRANCE | POPULATION  | MEN UNDER ARMS |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|
|                           | <i>1914</i>      |             |                |
| Austria-Hungary . . . . . | July 28          | 50,000,000  | 3,000,000      |
| Germany . . . . .         | August 1         | 80,600,000  | 7,000,000      |
| Turkey . . . . .          | November 3       | 21,000,000  | 300,000        |
|                           | <i>1915</i>      |             |                |
| Bulgaria . . . . .        | October 4        | 5,000,000   | 300,000        |
|                           |                  | 156,600,000 | 10,600,000     |

commerce. Attempts to take St. Quentin, the important mining town of Lens, and the city of Cambrai were not successful for another year, but the terrible slaughter went on, and tens of thousands were killed every week.

### III. THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION; THE BOLSHEVIKI

**990. The Russian Revolution (March, 1917).** In March, 1917, one of the chief belligerent countries, Russia, underwent such a tremendous internal change as greatly to modify the course of the war and the problem of peace. We must now consider the astonishing revolution which led to the overthrow of the old Russian despotism and the retirement of Russia from the war.

The world conflict had hardly opened in 1914 before it revealed the corruption, the weakness, the inefficiency, indeed in some cases the treason, of the Tsar's court and his imperial officials. The millions of Russians who perished in the trenches of the Eastern Front in vain endeavors to advance into Germany and Austria-Hungary or to stem the tide of German invasion were ill supported by their government. The Duma became unmanageable, and in December, 1916, it passed a resolution declaring that "dark forces" were paralyzing the government and betraying the nation's interests. This referred especially to the German wife of the Tsar, and the influence exercised over her and at court by a monk named Ras-

putin, who opposed every modern reform. Rasputin was murdered, and the angry Tsar proceeded to dismiss the liberals from the government and to replace them by the most unpopular officials he could find. He seemed to be declaring war on every liberal movement and reverting to the methods of Nicholas I. Meantime the country was becoming more and more disorganized. There was a distressing scarcity of food in the cities and a growing repugnance among the people to the continuance of the war.



FIG. 133. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PETROGRAD SOVIET

Women as well as men participate in the discussions. Most of the men are in peasant or workmen's garb. Great power was vested in this committee

**991. The Tsar Overthrown.** Bread riots broke out in Petrograd in March, 1917, but the troops refused to fire on the people, and the Tsar's government found itself helpless. When ordered to adjourn, the Duma defied the Tsar and called for the establishment of a provisional government. The Tsar, hastening back to Petrograd from the front, was stopped by representatives of the new provisional government on March 15, 1917, and induced to sign his own and his son's abdication in favor of his brother, Grand Duke Michael. But Michael refused the honor unless it were authorized by a constitutional assembly; this amounted to an abdication of



the Romanoffs, who had ruled Russia for more than three centuries. There was no longer any such thing in the world as "the autocrat of all the Russias." The Tsar's relatives renounced their rights, his high officials were imprisoned in the very fortress of Peter and Paul where they had sent so many revolutionists, and political prisoners in Russia and Siberia received the joyous tidings that they were free. Later the Tsar and the immediate members of his family were shot by the Bolsheviki. The world viewed with astonishment this abrupt and complete collapse of the ancient system.

**992. The Socialists gain Control of the Russian Government.**

A revolutionary cabinet was formed of men of moderate views on the whole, but Alexander Kerensky, a socialist and representative of the Workingmen's and Soldiers' Council, was made minister of justice. The new cabinet declared itself in favor of many reforms, such as liberty of speech and of the press; the right to strike; the substitution of militia for the old police; universal suffrage, including women. But the socialists were not content, and through their Council of Workingmen's and Soldiers' Delegates began to exercise great power. By July, 1917, all the more moderate members of the provisional government had been forced out and their places taken by socialists. A desperate attempt to lead the flagging Russian troops forward to victory against the Austrians utterly failed, and as time went on the demand for an immediate peace "without annexations and indemnities" became louder and bolder.

**993. The Bolshevik Revolution (November, 1917).** At length the storm which had long been gathering broke. Early in the revolution a council of workmen's and soldiers' deputies, or "soviet," had been set up in Petrograd and had begun to dispute the authority of the Duma. All over Russia similar soviets, or councils of workmen, soldiers, and peasants, were instituted, and finally, in November, under two leaders, Lenin and Trotzky, supported by soldiers, they overturned the Kerensky government, founding instead "a dictatorship of the proletariat." The faction which engineered this enterprise was known as the Bolsheviki, or "majority men," a term given to them several years before when they formed a majority of the Russian socialists.

**994. Peace of Brest-Litovsk.** The Bolsheviki proceeded to abolish private property in land and capital and to institute a "communist system." They bitterly denounced the war as an "imperialist struggle for trade and territory," and they called upon the warring powers to join them in a peace conference. Receiving no replies, they opened the Russian archives and published secret treaties drawn up by the Allies against Germany. Then, late in December, they began peace negotiations with the Central Powers at Brest-Litovsk, on the eastern boundary of Poland.

The Russian delegation submitted their program of "no annexations and no indemnities," and complained of the extortion practiced by the Teutonic allies. But the Bolsheviki were helpless in the face of the German demands. Finland and the Ukraine (which comprises a great part of southern Russia) declared themselves independent and (under German influence, it is supposed) established governments of their own. So on March 3, 1918, the representatives of the Bolsheviki concluded a peace with the Central Powers in which they agreed to "evacuate" the Ukraine and Finland and to surrender Poland, Lithuania, Courland, Livonia, and certain districts in the Caucasus (see maps, pages 406 and 550), all of which were to exercise the right of establishing such government as they pleased. It is estimated that in this way Russia lost about a third of her population, a third of her railways, nearly three fourths of her iron mines, about 90 per cent of her coal mines, and her chief industrial towns and richest fields. Shortly after, the capital of Russia was transferred from Petrograd to Moscow. The result was that Russia was dismembered, and all the western and southern regions were, for the time being, under the strong influence of the Germans.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. ISSUES OF THE WAR

**995. Grave Problems antedating the War.** The war naturally rendered acute every chronic disease which Europe had failed to remedy in the long period of general peace. France had never given up hopes of regaining Alsace-Lorraine, which had been wrested

<sup>1</sup> For the later phases of the Bolshevik régime see §§ 1058 ff., below.

from her after the war of 1870-1871. The Poles continued to aspire to appear on the map as an independent nation. Both the northern Slavs of Bohemia and the southern Slavs in Croatia, Bosnia, and Slavonia were discontented with their relations to Austria-Hungary, of which they formed a part. The Irredentists of Italy had long laid claim to important coast lands belonging to Austria. Serbia and Bulgaria were bitterly at odds over the arrangements made at the close of the Second Balkan War (§ 942). Rumania longed for Transylvania and Bukowina. Then there were the old questions as to what was to be done with the remaining vestiges of the Turkish Empire and who was to control Syria and Mesopotamia. In the Far East Japan's interests in China offered an unsolved problem. The Germans emphasized the necessity of doing something about the discontent with British rule in India and Ireland.

**996. New Problems due to the War.** The progress of the war had added new territorial perplexities. The Central Powers at the end of 1917 were in military possession of Belgium, Luxemburg, northeastern France, Poland, Lithuania, Courland, Serbia, Montenegro, and Rumania. Great Britain had captured Bagdad and Jerusalem. In Africa Germany's colonies were all in the hands of her enemies, and in the Pacific her possessions had been taken over by Japan and Australia. Were all these regions, conquered by one or the other of the belligerent groups, to be given back or not? Then what about Belgium, whose people had been overrun and taxed and pillaged by their conquerors? And what of northeastern France, so terribly devastated? Was not reparation due to these unhappy victims of the war?

**997. War on War.** But to many high-minded people all these questions seemed of minor importance compared with the overwhelming world problem of how mankind should conspire to put an end to war forever. The world of to-day—compared with that of Napoleon's time, when the last great international struggle had taken place—is so small, and the nations have been brought so close together and are so dependent on one another, that it seemed as if the time had come to join in a last, victorious *war on war*. In 1815 it required a month or more to cross the Atlantic; now less than

six days were necessary; and above its waves airplanes might soon be soaring, far swifter than any steamer. Formerly the oceans were great barriers separating America from Europe, and the Orient from America; but, like the ancient bulwarks round medieval cities, they have now become highways on which men of all nations hasten to and fro. Before the war express trains were regularly traversing Europe from end to end at a speed of from forty to fifty miles an hour, and the automobile vied with the locomotive in speed, whereas at the time of the Congress of Vienna no one could get about faster than a horse could travel. The telegraph and the telephone enabled news to be flashed to the most distant parts of the earth more quickly than Louis XVIII could send a message from one part of Paris to another. The wireless apparatus kept vessels, no matter how far out at sea, in constant touch with the land.

**998. Interdependence of Nations.** Nations now depend on one another for food, clothes, and every sort of necessity and refinement. Britain hoped to end the war by cutting off Germany from her usual communication with other countries, and Germany flattered herself she could starve England by sinking the thousands of vessels which supplied her tables with bread and meat. Even the rumor of war upsets the stock exchanges throughout the world. Nations read one another's books, profit by one another's scientific discoveries and inventions, and go to one another's plays. Germans, Italians, French, and Russians contribute to musical programs listened to in New York, Valparaiso, or Sydney. We continue to talk of *independent* nations, but only a few isolated, squalid savage tribes can be said any longer to be independent of other peoples. In an ever-increasing degree America is a part of Europe, and Europe is a part of America, and their histories tend to merge into the history of the whole world.

**999. International Agreements before the War.** The war served merely to emphasize all these things, which were being recognized in the previous quarter of a century. The Hague conferences, the establishment of The Hague international tribunal, and the various arbitration treaties had all been directed toward the suppression of the ancient plague of war. International arrange-



ments in regard to coinage, postal service, commerce, and transportation had encouraged good understanding and coöperation. Innumerable international societies, congresses, and expositions had brought foreign peoples together and illustrated their manifold common interests.

**1000. Cost of Preparedness.** The old problem of armaments—the possibility of getting rid of the crushing burden and constant peril of vast standing armies and the competition in dreadnaughts and cruisers—was made a burning question by the war, because




FIG. 134. A BRITISH AIR FLEET DRAWN UP FOR INSPECTION

the European nations involved were bound to emerge from the conflict either bankrupt or with unparalleled financial obligations. At the same time the progress of the deadly art of killing one's fellow men advanced so rapidly with the aid of scientific discovery and the stress of war that what was considered adequate military preparedness before the war would seem absurdly inadequate after its close. Giant guns, aircraft, "tanks," and poisonous gases have, among other things, been added in the last few years to the older devices of destruction, and the submarine suggested a complete revolution in naval strategy.

**1001. Issue of "Militarism."** The great issue of the war to idealists was really "militarism," which includes two closely asso-

ciated problems. First, should diplomats be permitted any longer to carry on secret negotiations and pledge their respective nations to secret agreements which might involve war? Secondly, should a government be permitted to declare war without the approval of the great mass of its citizens? Now those opposed to Germany were all in hearty agreement in regarding her as representing the most dangerous form of militarism, which had plunged the whole world into a horrible war and would, unless destroyed, remain a constant menace to future peace.

**1002. The Autocratic System of Germany.** To the countries enrolled in the war against the Central Powers, especially England and the United States, it seemed that the German system of government and the ideals of the German ruling class were dangerous to the peace and safety of the world. At the head stood the kaiser, king of Prussia and German emperor, claiming to rule by God's will. Under him was the chancellor, his personal appointee, and the cabinet, all chosen by the emperor. The upper house of the Parliament consisted of representatives of the various German principalities and kingdoms and the three free cities. The lower house, the Reichstag, composed of delegates elected by German voters, could talk as much as it liked, but it had little control over the cabinet and practically no control over the use of the army. It is true that an offensive war could not be declared without its consent, but all that the kaiser and the war party had to do to escape this check was to proclaim a war "defensive."

**1003. The Kaiser as the Chosen of God.** The German kaiser continually gave offense to people in England and the United States who believed in democracy. Repeatedly he spoke of himself as the anointed of the Lord. Again and again he talked about making his own will supreme, no matter what the German people wanted. Never did he weary in praising his mighty army and warning all the world against its strength and prowess. If Germany was in fact no worse an offender than some of the other European countries, it was certain that the kaiser gave the appearance of being the greatest "saber-rattler" on the globe. Germans who laughed at him too openly or who even boldly criticized his views and conduct

were likely to be quickly imprisoned for *lese majesty*—the crime of insulting “the All-Highest.”

**1004. Power of the German Army.** Practically independent of the Reichstag was the German army. First of all, it was directed by professional officers appointed by the kaiser. Its high commanders formed a small, secret circle that looked upon the German House of Representatives with little respect. During the negotiations preceding the outbreak of the World War they had a secret wire connecting them with the high command of the Austrian army, and while the German chancellor was urging peace they were advising the Austrians to stand firm. The subordinate officers of the army were recruited largely from the upper classes, especially the feudal lords of Prussia, known as Junkers, now enriched not only by their lands but also by investments in German industries. As a general thing the army officers regarded the mass of the people as useful to do hard work and to serve as “cannon fodder” for the army.

**1005. German Justification for the Army.** Now it would be a mistake to suppose that this system was without general support in Germany. On the contrary, the ruling classes and a large portion of the people defended it on a clearly reasoned-out theory. The Germans, they said, were surrounded by historic enemies and were forced to maintain an invincible army for self-defense; therefore its primary purpose was not offensive, but to protect the Fatherland against unscrupulous neighbors who in previous centuries had kept Germany disunited and helpless and made her lands their battle ground. That army, ran the argument, had freed Germany of Napoleon I and had prevented Napoleon III from overrunning the country. Moreover, it was said, if the Reichstag interfered too much with the army, its secrets would become known, and in time of danger it might be prevented from striking soon enough to win a war. Finally, the upper classes thought the army might be very useful if the socialists should attempt to make an uprising at home, as they often threatened to do. Consequently many Germans who did not like the army’s methods accepted them as necessary evils.

**1006. Plans of the German Military Party.** If the German military party did not, as it claimed, actually want the war, there was no doubt about its methods and plans after the war was started. Operating on the theory that severity and terror were useful in gaining ends quickly, its army invaded the neutral country of Belgium and carried off Belgian citizens to work in German factories and mines. In any case, whatever defense was offered, its conduct was shocking to a great body of British and American people, who had never had any experience with a large professional army.

More than this. After the war was begun the German military party supported the demands of the imperialists, who proposed that in the hour of victory new colonies and territories should be annexed and the conquered nations be forced to pay heavy indemnities. It even resisted the idea of restoring and freeing Belgium after that helpless country had been overrun in the haste to get into France. There was no doubt about what the German military party would have done if it had come out triumphant. All its ideas of right were made plain in the severe terms imposed on the Russians by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 when Russia surrendered. It was hard to believe that if Germany had won the war she would not have despoiled France, and England as well, and then challenged America on land and sea. It was this state of affairs which led many American people who did not think England, France, and Russia wholly guiltless in the war to fear Germany and hope for her defeat.

**1007. President Wilson states American War Aims.** President Wilson on more than one occasion stated the principles for which the United States was prepared to fight to the bitter end. For example, on August 1 Pope Benedict XV sent forth a peace message in which he urged Christendom to cease from its fratricidal carnage, lay down its arms, and revert in general to the *status quo ante*. This was answered by President Wilson on August 27. He maintained that no peace was possible with the existing irresponsible government of Germany. "This power is not the German people. It is the ruthless master of the German people. . . . We



cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything that is to endure, unless explicitly supported by such conclusive evidence of the will and purpose of the German people themselves as the other peoples of the world would be justified in accepting. Without such guarantees for disarmament, covenants to set up arbitration in the place of war, territorial adjustments, reconstitution of small nations, if made with the German government, no man, no nation could now depend on."


In his message on the opening of Congress on December 4, 1917, President Wilson was still clearer: "The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their Empire, a war of desperate self-defense against deliberate aggression. Nothing could be more grossly or wantonly false, and we must seek by the utmost openness and candor as to our real aims to convince them of its falseness. We are in fact fighting for their emancipation from fear . . . of unjust attack by neighbors, or rivals or schemers after world empire. No one is threatening the existence or independence or the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire. . . . We intend no wrong against the German Empire, no interference with her internal affairs." Lloyd George reiterated this last sentiment in a speech before the House of Commons.

**1008. The Fourteen Points.** Again, on January 8, 1918, President Wilson stated a program of world peace which embraced fourteen points. The chief of these were: no secret international understandings or treaties; absolute freedom of navigation in peace and war, except when portions of the sea might be closed by international understanding; removal of economic barriers and reduction of armaments; impartial adjustment of all colonial claims; restoration of Belgium and evacuation of territories occupied by Teutonic allies during the war; righting of the wrong done to France when Alsace-Lorraine was seized by Germany; freeing of Asiatic dependencies of Turkey; and the formation of a general association of nations for the purpose of insuring the independence of great and small states alike. This program was heartily and

unreservedly approved by the representatives of the English work-  
ingmen and made clearer than any previous declaration the pur-  
poses of the United States in entering the war against Germany.

## V. COURSE OF THE WAR AFTER THE ENTRANCE OF THE UNITED STATES

1009. **The German Drive of March, 1918.** On March 21, 1918,  
the Germans began a great drive on the Western Front with the



© U. S. Official

FIG. 135. BRITISH VESSEL THROWING UP A SMOKE SCREEN TO PROTECT  
AN AMERICAN TRANSPORT

The British marine greatly aided in securing the safe passage of American  
troops. Note the "camouflage" (disguise coloring) of the transport

hope of gaining a decisive victory and forcing the Allies to sue for  
peace. Germany was in a hurry, for she knew that her U-boat war-  
fare was not bringing England to her knees, that the United States  
troops were beginning to arrive in ever-increasing numbers, and that  
the German plans for getting supplies from Russia were meeting  
with little success. Moreover, the German people were suffering  
bitter hardships and might at any time complain that the final vic-  
tory which the kaiser promised them was all too long in coming.

The southern and eastern portions of the Western Front were held by French armies, the northern line by the British. Hindenburg and the other German generals decided to strike at the southernmost of the British armies, in the region of the Somme. If they could defeat it, they would thereby separate the French and British and so prevent their helping one another. For several days the



© U. S. Official

FIG. 136. AMERICAN TROOPS MARCHING TO TAKE THEIR PLACES AT THE FRONT IN THE MARNE VALLEY

Germans were victorious and were able to push the British back almost to Amiens. But the French rushed to the aid of their allies; the drive was checked; and Amiens, with its important railroad connections, was saved.

No previous conflict of the war had been so terrible as this. It is estimated that over four hundred thousand men were killed, wounded, or captured. The Germans only regained the devastated territory from which they had retired a year before, however, and their fierce efforts to advance farther failed.





MARSHAL FOCH





**1010. Foch Commander in Chief.** The grave danger in which the Allies found themselves finally convinced them that their safety lay in putting all their forces—French, British, Italian, and the newly arriving troops from America—under a single commander in chief. All agreed that the French general Ferdinand Foch (appointed March 28, 1918) was the most likely to lead them all to victory. Their confidence was justified. Almost immediately matters began to mend.

**1011. Final Efforts of the Germans.** Everyone knew that the Germans would soon make a second drive somewhere on the long front of one hundred and fifty miles, but at what point the Allies could only conjecture. The new blow came on April 9, when the kaiser's armies attempted to break through the British defenses between Arras and Ypres, with the intention of reaching Calais and the English Channel. The suspense was tense for a time; but after retreating a few miles the



FIG. 137. MARSHAL JOFFRE

British made a stand and were ordered by their commander to die, if necessary, at their posts. This checked the second effort of the Germans to break through. In the latter part of May the German armies attempted a third great attack, this time in the direction of Paris. They took Soissons and Château-Thierry, which brought them within about forty miles of the French capital. In June they made a feebler effort to extend toward the south gains they had succeeded in making in the first drive. Here they were opposed for the first time by the American troops, who fought with great bravery and ardor. And here the German successes came to an end.

**1012. United States Troops in Action.** The first contingent of United States troops had arrived in France in June, 1917, under the command of General Pershing, who had a long and honorable record as a military commander. He had in his younger days fought Indians in the West; he had served in the Spanish War and later had subdued the fierce Moros in the Philippine Islands.




FIG. 138. GENERAL PERSHING

By the first of July, 1918, about a million American troops had reached France and were either participating actively in the fierce fighting or being rapidly and efficiently trained. They had taken their first town by the end of May, 1918, and gained great distinction for themselves by coöperating with the French in frustrating the German attempt to break through at Château-Thierry. Northwest of that town they forced back, early in June, the picked German troops sent against them. In these conflicts the American marines were especially conspicuous.

**1013. The German Tide Turned.** During the following weeks the Germans lost tens of thousands of men in minor engagements. Finally, on July 15, 1918, they made a last great effort to take Reims and force their way to Paris, but this drive was speedily turned into a retreat. During the following month the combined efforts of the French and Americans served to drive the Germans far back from the Marne and put an end to their hopes of advancing on Paris. The French general Mangin warmly praised the valor of the Americans during these "splendid" days when it was his privilege to fight with them "for the deliverance of the world." Then the British began an offensive on the Somme east and south

of Amiens. By the end of September the Germans had been pressed back to the old Hindenburg line; even this was pierced at some points, and the Allied troops were within a few miles of the Lorraine boundary.

**1014. American Soldiers in the Last Phase.** The American troops in France, numbering slightly over two million men before the armistice was signed, on November 11, 1918, were scattered along the whole Western Front; it is estimated that nearly one million four hundred thousand actually took part in the fearful struggle against the Germans.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to mention here all the battles in which they fought valiantly, side by side with the French or the British, as the hosts of the enemy were rapidly pushed back. In the middle of September the Americans distinguished themselves by taking the St. Mihiel salient and bringing their lines within range of the guns of the great German fortress of Metz. Reënforcing the British, they performed acts of exceptional valor in capturing the St. Quentin canal tunnel far to the north, where thousands of lives were sacrificed. In the Argonne Forest, and especially in the capture of Sedan on November 7, the United States troops played a conspicuous part. In the months from June to November, 1918, the battle casualties of the American expeditionary forces—killed, wounded, missing, and prisoners—amounted to about three hundred thousand.

**1015. Conditions in Russia.** On the other fronts the fortunes of war were turning in favor of the Allies. Germany, instead of being able to get supplies from demoralized Russia, met resistance at every point. The people of the Ukraine resented her domination and began to look to the Allies to assist them in forming their new republic. In Finland civil war raged between the "White Guard" (Nationalist) and the "Red Guard" (Bolshevik), while British and American troops on the Murmansk coast to the north coöperated with local Russian troops to oppose the Bolsheviki.

At Vladivostok, far away across Siberia, British, Japanese, and

<sup>1</sup>The United States proposed to have at least four million men in France by June 30, 1919. The limits of the draft were extended so as to include all able-bodied men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five.



American forces landed with the object of working westward through Siberia and, as they hoped, restoring order. Among the enemies of the Bolsheviki was a Czechoslovak army composed of former Austrian subjects who had deserted to fight in Russia for the Allies.

**1016. Bulgaria capitulates (September 29, 1918).** As a part of the great forward movement organized by General Foch, the combined Serbian, Greek, British, and French forces in the Balkans once more became active in Serbia and rapidly pushed back the Bulgarians, who, with the help of the Germans and Austrians, had overrun the country three years before (§ 971). Neither Germany nor Austria could send aid to their ally, and on September 29, 1918, the Bulgarians threw up their hands and asked for an armistice. This was granted on condition of absolute surrender. The defection of Bulgaria proved decisive, and it was clear that Turkey could not keep up the fight when cut off from her western allies, and that Austria-Hungary, open to invasion through Bulgaria, must soon yield.

**1017. Turkey Surrenders (October 31).** Turkey was the next to give up the fight. In Palestine General Allenby followed up the capture of Jerusalem (December, 1917) by the relentless pursuit of the Turkish armies. The British and French speedily conquered Syria, taking the great towns of Damascus and Beirut, and the Syrians could celebrate their final deliverance from the century-long cruel subjugation to the Turks. The Turkish army in Mesopotamia was also captured by the British. So Turkey was quickly forced to follow Bulgaria's example. On October 31 she accepted the terms of surrender imposed by the Allies.

## VI. FALL OF THE HOHENZOLLERN AND HAPSBURG DYNASTIES AND CLOSE OF THE WAR

**1018. Plight of the Germans.** Thus the loudly heralded "peace drive" of the Germans had turned into a hasty retreat on the Western Front, and their eastern allies had dropped away. The oncoming troops from the United States, steadily streaming across

the Atlantic, brought new hope to the Allies; for the Americans were fresh and brave and full of enthusiasm, and they were backed by a great and rich country, which had thrown its well-nigh inexhaustible resources on the side of the war-weary Allies in their fight against the Central Powers.

The German people now began to see that they had been grossly deceived by their rulers. The ruthless use of the U-boats had not brought England to her knees, but had aroused a new and mighty enemy across the Atlantic, whose armies were transported across the ocean in spite of the submarines. The victory over Russia so wildly celebrated in Berlin at the opening of 1918 and the hard terms imposed by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk had not yielded the food supplies for the German armies and the suffering population in accordance with promises held out at the time. With her commerce ruined, her debt enormously increased, and all prospects of forcing her foes to pay her bills gone, the plight of Germany was terrible beyond description. Deserted by her eastern allies and supported only by feeble Austria-Hungary, she had to face almost alone a coalition of the whole world.

**1019. Austria Collapses (November 3).** Even Austria was now at the end of her tether. Torn by internal dissensions, threatened by a revolt of the peoples subject to her, disheartened by scarcity of food and by the reverses on the Western Front, she sent a note to President Wilson on October 7 requesting that an armistice be considered. By the end of the month her armies were giving way before the Italians, who in a second battle of the Piave not only swept the Austrians out of northern Italy but quickly occupied Trent and the great seaport of Trieste. On November 3 Austria-Hungary unconditionally surrendered, accepting the severe terms that the Allies imposed on her.

But Austria-Hungary had already disappeared from the map of Europe. The Czechoslovak republic had been proclaimed, and the Jugoslavs no longer recognized their former connection with Austria and Hungary. Hungary itself was in revolt and was proclaimed a republic. Under these circumstances the Hapsburg emperor of Austria and king of Hungary abdicated (November 11).

**1020. Germany asks for Peace.** Germany herself was on the verge of collapse as it proved. Early in October it seems to have become apparent to her military rulers that there was no possibility of stopping the victorious advance of the Allies, and the imperial chancellor opened a correspondence (transmitted through the Swiss minister) with President Wilson in regard to an armistice and peace. President Wilson made it plain that the Allies would not stop their advance except on condition that Germany surrender and on such terms as to render it impossible for her to renew the war. "For," the President added, in his third note, "the nations of the world do not and cannot trust the word of those who have hitherto been the masters of German policy."

**1021. The Hohenzollerns Overthrown.** The German War Council, including the kaiser and the crown prince, made a vain effort to save the old system. General Ludendorff, especially conspicuous for his arrogant military spirit, was sent off, and the Allies were informed that far-reaching changes in the government had been undertaken which assured the people a complete control not only over the government but over the military powers (October 27). The constitution of the German Empire was amended and the English system of cabinet responsibility to parliament was introduced. Thus a reform long opposed by the kaiser was accepted under the stress of dire necessity and a step taken in the direction of democracy.

Soon the German government began to deal directly with General Foch in its eagerness to secure an armistice at any cost, for a great revolution was imminent. Moreover, the Allied forces were closing in on Germany all along the line from the North Sea to the Swiss boundary, and the Germans were retreating with enormous losses of men and supplies. On November 9 it was announced, to the astonishment of the world, that His Majesty, Emperor William II, had abdicated. He soon fled to Holland, and that world nuisance, the House of Hohenzollern, was a thing of the past. The king of Bavaria had been forced off his throne the day before, and all the former monarchies which composed the German Empire were speedily turned into republics. On November 10 a revolution

took place in Berlin, and a Socialist leader, Friedrich Ebert, assumed the duties of chancellor with the consent of the previous chancellor and all the secretaries of state. Even Prussia had become a republic over night. The old German Empire was no more.

**1022. Terms of the Armistice.** Meanwhile negotiations in regard to an armistice were in progress. Representatives of the German government made their way across the lines, met General Foch on November 8, and learned the terms which the Allies had drawn up for their acceptance.

The Germans were required to evacuate within two weeks all the territory they had occupied—Belgium, northeastern France, Luxemburg, as well as Alsace-Lorraine. Moreover, the German troops were to retire beyond the right bank of the Rhine, and that portion of Germany which lies west of the river was to be occupied by troops of the Allies. All German troops in territories formerly belonging to Austria-Hungary, Rumania, Turkey, and Russia were to be immediately withdrawn. Germany was to hand over her war vessels, surrender all her submarines and vast supplies of war material, and put her railroads at the disposal of the Allies. These provisions were designed to make any renewal of the war on Germany's part absolutely impossible. Hard as were the terms, the Germans accepted them promptly, and on November 11 the armistice was signed. The World War was now at an end.

#### QUESTIONS

I. What measures did Germany adopt in her submarine warfare? What caused the United States to declare war on Germany?

II. Give a list of the powers at war with Germany and her allies in 1918. Give the chief military operations of 1917.

III. Describe the Russian revolution of 1917. What were the aims of Kerensky? What were the objects of the Bolsheviki? Give the terms of the peace of Brest-Litovsk.

IV. What were the chief sources of international rivalry and misunderstanding before the World War? What new problems were added by the war? What is your attitude in regard to war? What makes war more disastrous now than it was in Napoleon's time? How did the Ger-



mans defend the maintenance of a powerful standing army? What were the war aims of the United States according to President Wilson? Give some of the chief items in the Fourteen Points.

V. Describe the German drive of 1918. What part did the United States troops play? Why do you suppose that the Germans were unable to maintain their positions? What members of the German alliance first surrendered?

VI. Describe the fall of the Hohenzollern dynasty. What were the terms of the armistice?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

HAYES, *A Brief History of the Great War*: (1) the United States enters the war, pp. 213-224; (2) the war in 1917, pp. 261-298; (3) the Russian revolution, pp. 225-260; (4) Germany's last drives in 1918, pp. 299-325; (5) triumph of the Allies, pp. 326-348; (6) fall of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns, pp. 348-364.

## CHAPTER XXXI

### THE PEACE OF VERSAILLES AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

#### I. THE PEACE CONFERENCE

**1023. The Nations Represented.** On January 18, 1919, on the anniversary of the day in 1871 when the German Empire had been proclaimed, and in the very hall at Versailles where that ceremony had taken place with such pomp (§ 539), there assembled a conference of the allied and associated powers to pronounce doom on the German Empire and its defeated satellites. It was a marvelous spectacle. Seventy-two delegates spoke for thirty-two states. The United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan had five each. Belgium, Brazil, and Serbia were each assigned three. To Canada, Australia, South Africa, India, China, Greece, Hejaz, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Siam, and Czechoslovakia there were allotted two apiece, and the remaining states—New Zealand, Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, and Uruguay—each had one delegate.

In the name of the United States spoke in person the President, Woodrow Wilson, who for five trying years had led our country in peace and war. The spokesman for England was David Lloyd George, once a hated radical reformer, now the idol of a victorious nation; for France, the grim-visaged premier, Clemenceau, whose resolute will had aroused all Frenchmen for the last supreme effort; for Italy, Orlando. What historic memories did the scene call to the imagination! It carried the minds of informed spectators back through the long years of Europe's painful travail—back through the wars for Italian and German unity, the Napoleonic struggle, the French Revolution, the partition of Poland, the wars in the name of religion, and the long period of feudal anarchy and disorder, even to the very days when the empire of Rome stretched out from the heather of Scotland to the sands of Arabia. What

distant and strange lands did it summon to the vision! The ends of the earth were brought together. The dusky Siamese from the realm of the late King Chulalongkorn and the black spokesman



FIG. 139. THE "BIG THREE"

Lloyd George (to the left), Clemenceau, and President Wilson returning from Versailles after the signing of the treaty of peace with Germany

from Liberia sat in conference with the yellow marquis from Japan and the white premier from Australia. What tongues! What civilizations! What religious faiths!

**1024. The Supreme Council.** This magnificent assemblage was, however, mainly a ceremonial conference. It seldom met, and then only for the purpose of approving decisions already taken. The real work of settling the affairs of the world was first committed to a supreme council of ten representing the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. This was later reduced to five. Then Japan dropped out and finally Italy, leaving only President Wilson and Premiers Lloyd George and Clemenceau—the “Big Three”—who assumed the burden of all the great decisions. On May 6 their work was completed, and in a secret session of the full conference, at which a digest was read to the assembled delegates, the whole treaty was approved, a few of the powers making reservations or objections. The next day the treaty was presented to the Germans, who after long and strenuous protests finally signed on the last day of grace, June 23. The German treaty, by far the most important, was followed by agreements with Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey. Taken together these great documents formed the legal basis of the general European settlement.

**1025. Terms of the Settlement.** The combined treaties make a huge volume. The German treaty alone embraces about eighty thousand words. Collectively they cover an immense range of subjects—a range so great that only the broadest outlines can be given here. For the purposes of simplicity and clearness the outstanding features may be grouped under five main heads: (1) the territorial settlement in Europe; (2) the destruction of German military power; (3) reparations for damages done by the Central Powers; (4) the disposition of German colonies and protectorates; (5) the League of Nations.

## II. THE NEW MAP OF EUROPE


**1026. Territories taken away from Germany.** By the terms of the Versailles treaty Germany gave up Alsace-Lorraine to France and the three towns of Moresnet, Eupen, and Malmédy to Belgium. She also ceded a great part of her province of Posen and West Prussia to the restored Polish nation, and she agreed that some of



her possessions in that region should join Poland if the people, by a popular vote called a *plebiscite*, decided in favor of it. She made a similar agreement with regard to Schleswig to determine whether its people preferred to join Denmark, and in 1920 parts of that territory went to Denmark by popular vote. Danzig was made a free city under the control of the League of Nations but within the Polish customs union. Besides giving up this land in Europe, Germany surrendered all her over-sea colonies, to be turned over to the British Empire, France, and Japan as mandates under the League of Nations (§ 1037).

**1027. Dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.** In a special treaty signed at Saint-Germain-en-Laye near Paris on September 10, 1919, Austria recognized the fact that the war had broken up the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. In the last days of the war, while the Austrian armies were crumbling in defeat, several of the various nationalities that had long been united under the government at Vienna declared their independence. Far to the north a large section acquired in the three partitions of Poland was handed over to the new Polish republic. Between Austria-Hungary and Poland a new Slavic state, Czechoslovakia, was formed, and Austria recognized its independence. To the south, Trent, South Tyrol, Trieste, and Istria were ceded to Italy, and several provinces were transferred to the enlarged kingdom of Serbia, known as Yugoslavia. To the east, Hungary was declared independent, and large slices of territory were given to Rumania. By this process the once proud Austrian Empire was dissolved and Austria transformed into a republic, reduced in size to an area less than that of Ireland.

**1028. The New Baltic States.** In the break-up of Russia which followed the collapse of her armies and the turmoil of the Bolshevik revolution, several important districts of that great empire declared their independence, for as conquered provinces of the Tsars they had been held down by military force alone. Curved round the eastern end of the Baltic Sea were four distinct nationalities—Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—that had maintained a strong local spirit in spite of all efforts at “Russifying” them. A large part of this territory had been wrested from Sweden by



© Ewing Galloway, N.Y.

## A GLIMPSE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

A small village in a farming district



© Ewing Galloway, N.Y.

A SCENE IN JUGOSLAVIA  
Looking down a street in Serajevo



Peter the Great in his attempt "to get a breathing space on the open water" (§ 40). When after the lapse of two hundred years Peter's once mighty empire was demolished by war and revolution, these four provinces asserted their independence and were recognized as separate republics. In this way Russia's outlet on the Baltic was reduced to a small strip near Petrograd which in 1924 was renamed Leningrad.

**1029. The Republic of Poland.** Out of three great fragments taken from Russia, Germany, and Austria, the republic of Poland was formed by revolutionary Polish leaders in 1918, and its independence was recognized by the Treaty of Versailles. Thus was restored the unity which had been destroyed by the three partitions that had taken place in the eighteenth century, nearly a hundred and fifty years before (§§ 56-60). In this way was realized the long-cherished dream of the Poles—the ideal for which Kosciusko had fought so valiantly (after serving under Washington in the war of American independence) and for which so many Poles had given their lives in the years that followed the destruction of their country.

**1030. Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia.** For other branches of the Slavic race the defeat of the Central Powers in the World War brought the "great day" of rejoicing. Among the peoples that cheered President Wilson's ideal of self-government for each nationality there was none more enthusiastic than the Czechs, of whom there were very many in the United States. Indeed, their most popular leader, Thomas Masaryk, came to America during the war and helped to carry on the agitation against Austria-Hungary. At the close of the struggle the old territories of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Slovakia united in forming the republic of Czechoslovakia with Masaryk as president. Beaten in battle, Austria had to accept the new nation as an equal.

By a curious turn of fate the little kingdom of Serbia, on which great Austria-Hungary declared war so lightly in 1914, came out of the conflict larger and more powerful than Austria herself. In the general settlement at the close of the war Carniola, Styria, Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia, and Montenegro



were united with Serbia to form the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, or, in popular usage, Yugoslavia.

**1031. Greater Rumania.** Rumania likewise profited from the ruin of Austria-Hungary and the collapse of Russia. She had joined the Allies in the war on the Central Powers after making terms as to what she should receive when the spoils were distributed at the end. When at last the Allies were victorious, Rumania was rewarded. She annexed Bessarabia (which had belonged to Russia since 1812), Bukowina (which was a part of Austria), and Transylvania and other portions of Hungary. In October, 1922, King Ferdinand and Queen Marie, who had succeeded to the throne in 1914, were crowned with great splendor as rulers of the enlarged kingdom. In vain did the Russians protest that Bessarabia had been stolen from them and that they would never surrender it. Greater Rumania was launched upon its uncertain course.

**1032. Turkey and Southeastern Europe.** For centuries the Christian powers had cried, "The Turk must be driven from Europe." Indeed, since the opening of the nineteenth century the territory ruled by Turkey in Europe had been diminished step by step, and it seemed in 1919 that at last the Turks would be driven back across the Straits. They had joined the Central Powers in the war and had shared their defeat. It looked as if their doom was at hand. Indeed, in August, 1920, the Turkish representatives at the Peace Conference were forced to sign the Treaty of Sèvres, which reduced their country to a petty state and put a heavy burden of damages on it.


In the meantime a powerful party of Turkish patriots, calling themselves Nationalists, had been organized under the leadership of Mustapha Kemal. Determined to save their country at all costs, they refused to abide by the Treaty of Sèvres, overthrew the Sultan, proclaimed a republic, and announced that they were ready to fight. When the Greeks declared war on Turkey to get some of the territory awarded to them in the treaty, the Nationalists badly defeated the invaders. As the Allies were now in no mood for another war, they came to terms in July, 1923, and signed the Treaty of Lausanne, which in effect marked a victory for Turkey.




30 Longitude 20 West 10 0 Longitude 10 East

# EUROPE

AFTER THE  
TREATY OF VERSAILLES  
1920





Japan





By the provisions of this treaty the Allied forces were to evacuate Constantinople and turn that city over to the Turkish government. The straits of the Dardanelles were to be open for the passage of ships of all nations, but it was agreed that the straits belonged to Turkey. Although Turkey lost Syria, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Egypt, and the Hejaz, she regained Smyrna and Eastern Thrace, thus keeping a foothold in Europe. Besides winning various advantages, she got rid of the hated "capitulations," or right of foreigners residing in Turkish territory to be tried by their own courts according to their own laws.

As an ally of the Central Powers, Bulgaria also was punished by a loss of territory. On the west a strip was turned over to Jugoslavia; on the south a small section was ceded to Greece; on the north a rich region on the Black Sea, the Dobrudja, which Bulgaria had seized, was returned to Rumania. In the settlement Bulgaria was cut off entirely from the Ægean Sea and merely allowed a right of passage to and from it for commercial purposes.

**1033. The New Russia.** In the remaking of the map the empire of the Tsars was cut down in several directions. As we have seen, the four states of Finland, Lithuania, Esthonia, and Latvia on the Baltic were cut off and made independent. Another portion was taken to help in forming the republic of Poland. On the Black Sea, Bessarabia was torn away and united with Rumania. For a while it looked as if the whole empire was destined to break up into numerous republics, such as the Ukraine, the Transcaucasian republic (including Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan), Turcoman, and the Far Eastern republic in Siberia; but by a gradual process these parts of the former Russian Empire were federated with the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic with its capital at Moscow. In the general settlement, therefore, Russia, which consisted of about one seventh of the land surface of the world in 1914, was reduced by more than one eighth. Instead of the strong rule of the Tsar, there were substituted the light ties of friendly federation, but the various parts of Russia held together under the new régime about as closely as before. Russia still spread from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean and from the Black Sea to arctic waters.

### III. SPECIAL TERMS IMPOSED ON GERMANY

**1034. Destruction of Germany's Military Power.** Besides taking away the territories enumerated above, the victorious Allies forced Germany to agree to other heavy terms. The entire navy, with minor exceptions, was turned over to the allied and associated powers, and the total equipment for the future was limited to six battleships, six light cruisers, and certain small vessels, but no submarines. The number of enlisted men and officers for the army was fixed at not more than one hundred thousand, the great General Staff was dissolved, and the manufacture of munitions was restricted. The Allies were to occupy the west bank of the Rhine until the terms of the treaty should be carried out.

**1035. Seizure of German Property.** In the treaty of peace the Allies especially reserved the right to take possession of property owned by German citizens and companies in the several countries at war with the Central Powers. Under this rule German citizens lost most of their banks, factories, railways, and investments in various parts of the world. The money so obtained was to be applied to the payment of claims and bills for damage against Germany. Having thus broken up the German concerns engaged in world trade, the Allies gave German commerce another severe blow by taking away all merchant vessels of 1600 tons burden and over and half the ships between 1600 and 1000 tons. In short, Germany's trading empire was, for the time being, demoralized.

**1036. Question of Reparations.** The amount of reparation for damages done was difficult to fix, especially in view of the uncertainty as to the exact ability of the vanquished to pay. Germany was, however, compelled to accept full responsibility for all damages, to pay shortly five billion dollars in cash and goods, and to make such other payments as might be ordered by an interallied reparations commission. Germany also undertook to deliver to Belgium, France, and Italy millions of tons of coal every year for ten years. By way of additional compensation to France, the rich coal basin of the Saar was placed under interallied control, to be exploited under French administration for a period of at least

fifteen years. Austria and the other associates of Germany were likewise laid under heavy obligations to the victors. Damage done to shipping by submarines and other vessels was to be paid for.

**1037. Disposal of Germany's Colonies: the Mandates.** The disposition of the German colonies and of the old Ottoman Empire also presented knotty problems. It was finally agreed that all German colonies and a few Turkish provinces, which were in a backward stage, should be placed under the control of certain powers that were to act as "mandatories" holding them as "a sacred trust of civilization." Under this system all the German colonies were turned over to the allied and associated powers and later assigned to their respective mandatories. German East Africa went to Great Britain and Belgium, and German Southwest Africa to the Union of South Africa. The German possessions in the southern Pacific went to New Zealand and Australia, and those to the north of the equator to Japan. Togoland and the Cameroons were divided between Great Britain and France. The mandates of the Turkish possessions of Irak (Mesopotamia) and Palestine were allotted to Great Britain; that of Syria to France. The mandatory principle was not adopted in the case of German rights in Shantung (§ 802), all of which were transferred to Japan. It was this action, which China deemed a violation of her rights, that led the Chinese delegation to withhold their signatures from the treaty.

#### IV. THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

**1038. The Covenant of the League of Nations.** First among the purposes which he had in mind in summoning his countrymen to arms President Wilson placed a device for putting an end to war. All through the United States the people spoke of the "war to end war," and no slogan called forth a deeper response from the masses. The President himself repeatedly declared that a general association of nations must be formed to guard the peace and protect all against the ambitions of the few. "As I see it," he said in a historic address delivered at the opening of the Fourth Liberty Loan campaign, "The constitution of the league of nations and



the clear definition of its objects must be a part, in a sense the most essential part, of the peace settlement itself."

**1039. Organization of the League.** Nothing was more natural, therefore, than the President's insisting at Paris that an international association should be formed, and Part One of the treaty with Germany—the Covenant of the League of Nations—was largely the outcome of his persistent labors. Within the league thus created were to be included all the allied and associated powers aligned against Germany, and nearly all the neutrals. Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Russia, Mexico, and Costa Rica were excluded, but they might be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly. The agencies of the League were to be three in number: (1) a permanent secretariat, now located at Geneva; (2) an Assembly consisting of one delegate from each country, dominion, or colony (including Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and India); (3) a Council consisting of representatives of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, and four other members selected by the Assembly of the League.

**1040. Duties of the League.** The duties imposed on the League by the Covenant and accepted by the members are numerous and important. The Council was to take steps to formulate a scheme for the reduction of armaments and to submit a plan for the establishment of a court of international justice (§ 1087). The members of the League on their part agree to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. They bind themselves to submit to arbitration or inquiry by the Council all disputes which cannot be adjusted by diplomacy, and in no case to resort to war until three months after the award. Should any member disregard its agreements, its action will be considered as an act of war against the League, which will cut off the trade and business of the disobedient state and recommend through the Council to the several associated governments what military measures shall be taken. In case the decision in any arbitration of a dispute is unanimous, the members of the League affected by it agree absolutely to abide by it.

**1041. Opposition to the League.** Such was the great program of international association with which President Wilson endeavored to redeem his pledges to his countrymen. Such was the treaty of peace with Germany which was formally presented to the countries concerned for their approval and laid before the Senate of the United States for ratification. The other nations rapidly set their seal upon it, but in the United States it was the object of a long and bitter debate, in which the Democratic and Republican parties became gradually aligned on opposite sides. President Wilson took the field in defense of the treaty. The United States Senate refused to ratify the treaty, and it became an issue in the presidential campaign of 1920. Shortly after the inauguration of President Harding, Congress declared the war with Germany and Austria at an end, and separate peace treaties were concluded. (For the work of the League see §§ 1086-1090.)

### QUESTIONS

I. Describe the organization of the Peace Conference. Who were the leaders at the Conference? Were the terms of the peace all put into one treaty? Under what general heads may the terms of peace be grouped?

II. What territories did Germany lose? What happened to the Austro-Hungarian Empire? Name the new countries created in eastern Europe. How was the republic of Poland built up? the republic of Czechoslovakia? How was Serbia enlarged? How was the kingdom of Rumania enlarged? Was Turkey driven out of Europe? Explain why. How was Bulgaria punished? Name some of the territories lost by Russia.

III. What steps were taken to destroy Germany's military power? How was her world trade temporarily broken up? State what was done with regard to reparations. What was done with the German colonies?

IV. How was the League of Nations organized? What provisions were made for avoiding wars? What position did the United States take?

### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

HAYES, *A Brief History of the Great War*: (1) terms of the settlement at Versailles, pp. 365-388; (2) the Covenant of the League of Nations, pp. 413-430; (3) losses of the war, pp. 388-395; (4) aftermath of the war, pp. 395-411.

## CHAPTER XXXII

### EUROPE'S SEARCH FOR PEACE AND PROSPERITY

#### I. PLIGHT OF EUROPE IN 1918

**1042. Difficulties in the Way of Quick Recovery.** The condition of Europe at the close of the war in 1918 was quite different from that at the end of the Franco-German war in 1871. The problem of peace could not now be solved by collecting a small bill of damages from the conquered and marching the soldiers home. The whole continent of Europe, except the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Switzerland, and Spain, had been involved in the war and had put forth almost superhuman energies in the fighting. Entire nations, not merely armies, had been embattled. Nearly all able-bodied men of fighting age had been sent to the front, while the men, women, and children left behind had been mobilized to furnish food and materials for the nations at war. All available factories had been turned from peaceful industries to the manufacture of war materials. Foreign trade had been demoralized—in the case of Germany almost destroyed. The map of Europe had been remade. Emperors, kings, princes, and governments had been overthrown. And to crown all the disorder, there had been a communistic revolution in Russia that threatened to spread to other countries and produce added difficulties.

**1043. Human Cost of the War.** It is now estimated that from first to last nearly sixty million men were mobilized by the belligerents on both sides—taken away from pursuits of peace to those of slaughter and destruction. Of the staggering total, about eight million were killed or died of wounds and disease. Of those who returned home from the front, approximately eighteen million carried wounds on their bodies—wounds ranging from minor scratches to terrible injuries that forever disabled them for useful labor of any kind.

**1044. Financial Burdens of the Nations.** When the soldiers came back from the front and the civilians turned once more to their regular work, they found awaiting them mountains of debts and high taxes. The total cost of the war in money paid out for fighting and in damage done to property could hardly be determined accurately, but the best estimates place it at more than three hundred billion dollars; that is, a sum at least equal in amount to the value of all the farms, houses, factories, railways, office buildings, furniture, telephones, telegraphs, mines, and other property in the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The national debt of Italy was raised from three billion dollars to eleven billion, that of France from seven billion to twenty-seven billion, that of Germany from one billion to forty billion (leaving out of account her bill for damages done), and that of Great Britain from three and one-half billion to thirty-four billion. In the case of Italy the debt was almost equal to the total national wealth, and the government of France owed a sum equal to half the amount that the French people possessed. Since heavy taxes had to be laid to pay these debts, there were good grounds for disputes among the voters of the various nations as to who should pay the most.

Afraid to tax the people heavily, all the war governments on the Continent began to issue paper money in vast quantities—inflated the currency and raised the cost of living with every new flood of paper notes. Gold and silver practically went out of circulation. Day after day carloads of printed money were spread abroad among the people until the state of affairs became simply absurd. The French franc, once worth about twenty cents, gradually fell until it reached about two cents in specie value. The German mark, worth about twenty-four cents when the war broke out, stood at seven cents in 1918 and then fell with lightning rapidity. By November 30, 1923, Germany had four hundred quintillion marks in circulation. In the summer of that year an American traveler paid a billion and a half marks for a dinner in a German restaurant and gave the waiter a tip of four hundred million marks, in all about three dollars in United States currency. In Russia the monetary system became about as ludicrous; as someone said, only astrono-



mers accustomed to deal in billions and trillions could keep a grocery store or even a news stand.

Naturally it was very difficult for anybody to do any regular business while this paper-money carnival lasted, and the people who depended on wages and salaries for a living were driven almost to desperation. For example, a German mechanic who agreed to work a week for two billion marks might find on pay day at the end of the week that the money in his envelope would buy only about half as much as on Monday, when he began. Evidently nothing could be done to start industry on sound principles until a new monetary system was established.

**1045. Industry Demoralized.** The state of European industries after the war added to the general distress. All northern France had been overrun by fighting armies and lay in ruins. Russia was racked by revolution, and manufacturing was almost at a standstill. Germany was shaken from center to circumference. Nearly all her banks, industries, investments, and commercial enterprises in other parts of the world had been seized by the victorious Allies. Her colonies and all the German property in them had been taken over by the conquerors. Having disrupted Germany's over-sea business, the Allies gave her a finishing blow by confiscating all her merchant ships of 1600 tons burden and over, and half her ships between that tonnage and 1000 tons. Austria lay in ruins. Once the manufacturing center for a great and prosperous empire, she was now reduced to a petty state with banks, factories, and business concerns enough for a country five or six times as large. And all the new states that rose after the war wanted to be independent manufacturing countries, so they put high tariffs on goods imported, thus injuring their neighbors' business. On top of all this there was the legacy of hatred left behind, which made the peoples of the various countries unwilling to buy from their former enemies or do business with them on fair terms.

**1046. Troubles in Launching New States.** To make confusion worse the six new and independent states (Poland, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, and Czechoslovakia), which had been cut away from Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary, had to get on

their feet. Long subject to foreign rule and having had little or no experience in self-government, their people encountered almost endless difficulties in making constitutions and getting their own governments started. Students of American history know what a hard time the people of the United States had after they won their independence from Great Britain, and how it took them several years to agree on a constitution and several years more to get business going prosperously again. Anyone who knows the history of this country between 1783 and 1795 can imagine some of the problems which the new countries in Europe had to meet after they won their independence in the World War.

**1047. Unrest in Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary.** In the upheavals of the war three of the oldest and strongest monarchies of Europe had been overthrown and their subjects called upon to create new governments. The Tsar had been dethroned and shot by revolutionists, as we have noted, and attempts had been made to set up the most radical communistic scheme that the world had ever seen. In other words, besides the ordinary tasks of political government, the Russian revolutionaries tried to seize and manage mines, factories, mills, and farms. In Germany, after the kaiser and the various princes fled, the general direction of things fell into the hands of socialists, who were beset on one side by the old imperialist party, that wanted to restore the monarchy, and on the other by communists, who wanted to follow the Russian example. Besides being separated, Austria and Hungary each had special problems to contend with. The former was torn by quarrels among socialists, monarchists, and moderates. The latter was governed for a time by liberals, under Count Karolyi, who admired the doctrines of Woodrow Wilson; then it was seized by communists in Budapest; then it passed under the control of a military dictator. For many months people wondered whether the defeated countries would prove capable of self-government at all.

**1048. Communist Uprisings.** The close of the war saw the socialistic parties stronger than ever in practically all European countries, as the elections of 1918-1920 showed. Everywhere there were radical workingmen who called upon their comrades to follow

the Russian example by overthrowing the existing government and setting up a "dictatorship of the proletariat." In Berlin, Munich, Vienna, and scores of industrial cities there were communist uprisings. In Munich and Budapest, where the communists were installed in power for a brief time, they were ousted by desperate fighting. In Berlin occurred a furious struggle between the extreme socialists, known as the Sparticides, and the government headed by the mild socialist Ebert. All over middle Europe, and



FIG. 140. PRESIDENT EBERT

in Italy as well, workmen seized factories and established local workers' councils on the model of the Russian soviets. For a long time it looked as if a large part of Europe might turn to Bolshevism.

#### 1049. Peasants' Uprisings.

In the country as well as in the towns eastern Europe was disturbed by uprisings of the people. As we have pointed out above (§ 89), serfdom and feudalism continued in that region long after they had disappeared in England. In East Prussia,

Poland, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, and Russia especially was this the case. In those countries, it is true, serfdom had been abolished, but the great estates and great landlords still remained. The peasants tilled the soil, and the lords made up the ruling class as in the Middle Ages. But in the revolutions of the World War peasants in those countries tried to take things into their own hands. In Russia they abolished the landlord class. Although the Bolsheviki declared that the land belonged to the State, the peasants seized their little holdings and tilled them just as if they owned them outright. In Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and East Prussia efforts were made, with relatively little success, to break up the great estates and to divide the land among the peasants. Never-

theless, in the agitations over the land question the peasants in the rural regions made about as much trouble for their landlords as workmen in towns made for their employers. Even in victorious Italy, especially the central and southern parts, where many great estates had survived from olden times, the peasants demanded that they should be given the soil they tilled, and they threatened to join with striking communists in upsetting the established order.

## II. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE NEW CONSTITUTIONS

**1050. Democracies and Republics in New Europe.** In the midst of the discouragements and turmoil described above, the peoples of central and eastern Europe managed in one way or another to establish new constitutions for their own government. When their plans are all reviewed together, it is seen that they present certain similarities among themselves and also certain contrasts with the older constitutions, such as those of France and the United States. All new states which rose on the ruins of the three great empires—Germany, Russia, and Austria-Hungary—were republics, with the possible exception of Hungary, which continued under a dictatorship. None of them declared openly in favor of a monarchy and called in some prince to rule over them. Everywhere chambers of peers speaking for great landlords were swept away; everywhere supreme power was declared to be vested in the people. "Privileges or discriminations due to birth or rank and recognized by law are abolished," run the words of the new German constitution. While Russia restricted the right to vote to citizens "who earn their livelihood by productive labor and soldiers and sailors in the Red army and navy," this rule, in theory at least, excluded from voting only a small part of the population. In other words, the whole tendency of the new European constitutions was in the direction of republican and democratic principles rather than of monarchical and upper-class rule.

**1051. Woman Suffrage.** It is a strange thing that the World War, which was supposed to be a supreme test of masculine valor, hastened the establishment of woman suffrage. It is true that the



woman-suffrage movement was well under way before the war broke out, but the conflict hastened rather than retarded it. Nearly all the new constitutions gave the ballot to women, and several of the old constitutions were amended in the same direction. Within less than a decade after the war began, the ballot had been given to women in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Great Britain, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sweden, and the United States. Of the great Western powers that took part in the "war for democracy," only France and Italy refused to admit women to the suffrage. While declaring political equality, the German constitution proclaims that "men and women have fundamentally the same civil rights."

**1052. Parliamentary versus Presidential Government.** On the eve of the World War there were, broadly speaking, two kinds of democratic government. One was the English parliamentary system, already described (§§ 634-639), in which the majority in the Parliament selected the cabinet officers and directed the whole government. The other was the American "presidential system," in which the legislative and executive departments were kept separate: the legislature made the laws, and the president appointed his own cabinet and enforced the laws.

When the constitution-makers set to work in Europe after the war, they generally adopted the English plan rather than the American. They provided, it is true, for a president, but they gave him few powers. To the legislature they assigned the right of controlling the cabinet and supervising the enforcement of the laws. In Poland, for example, the president was given a position akin to that enjoyed by the president in France: he was made a figurehead, without even the right to veto laws, and the cabinet was made responsible to the parliament. In Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, the president was given the veto power, he was authorized to dissolve the parliament and call a new election, and he was empowered to appoint cabinet officers, but only men approved by the parliament.

When the Germans were making their constitution in 1919, they discussed the American system in great detail. Many of them

wanted to copy it to some extent at least, arguing that a strong and independent president was necessary to hold the country together and keep order. The radical socialists, fearing the rise of a Bonaparte, opposed the presidential system strenuously, advocating in its place an executive council of ministers responsible to the parliament.

Between the extremes lay the final compromise. The German president, unlike his neighbor west of the Rhine, is not elected by the legislature in joint session, but by the voters at large directly. Unlike the American president, he does not have the veto power, but he may place a check on laws by referring any bill passed by parliament to the people for decision at the polls. Unlike the American president, he cannot appoint his cabinet officers at his own pleasure, but must take men who are acceptable to the majority in the parliament. In case of a controversy between the parliament and the president, the parliament may propose the recall of the president. In that case an election is held. If the president is defeated, he goes out of office; if the balloting is in his favor, the parliament is dissolved.

**1053. Proportional Representation.** Almost all the new constitutions provided schemes for giving each political party a number of representatives in parliament corresponding closely to the number of its votes cast in the election. Such a scheme is called "proportional representation." Under the old system of straight election—such as obtains generally in the United States, except in a few cities like Cleveland—whenever a party gets a majority of the votes in a district its candidate is declared elected and the minority has no representation at all. Thus it may happen in a city election, for instance, that the Republicans have twelve thousand votes and win all the aldermen, and that the Democrats have eleven thousand votes and do not win a single seat. Under proportional representation each party is assigned a number of seats, "proportioned" roughly to the number of its members. The method for reaching this result is complicated and need not detain us, but it is important to remember that nearly all the European countries have adopted it in one form or another.

**1054. Socialistic Features of the New Constitutions.** From the Declaration of the Rights of Man, issued during the French Revolution, down to 1918 a great deal was heard about "rights": about property rights and freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion. Little was said about the "duties" of citizens toward the government, except to pay taxes and bear arms, and not much about the duty of the government toward the people. In other words, the emphasis was on individual rights. The new constitutions of Europe, except that of Russia, also proclaim the rights of man, but they add important sections on the duties of citizens and governments. The German constitution, for example, announces that property rights carry with them "property duties," to be exercised in a way to serve "the general welfare." It also states that "the regulation of economic life [industry and business] must conform to the principles of justice, with the object of assuring humane conditions to all. Within these limits the economic liberty of the individual shall be protected." Russia, of course, goes far beyond that. Instead of guaranteeing the rights of property, the Russian constitution abolishes them. It proclaims not the rights of man but "the rights of laboring and exploited peoples." Instead of giving the right to vote to property owners, as was the old custom generally in Europe, it takes it away from them and confers it only upon "productive laborers." A great deal was said in other countries also about establishing "workers' councils," and the German constitution actually provided for these as well as for a political parliament, but the experiment did not prove to be of any special significance. In short, the new constitutions of Europe made compromises of some kind between individual rights and socialism, some leaning strongly in one direction and some in the other.

### III. RADICAL CHARACTER OF THE GERMAN AND RUSSIAN CONSTITUTIONS

**1055. Overthrow of the Old German System.** Owing to their size, their importance in European affairs, and the radical character of their revolutions, Germany and Russia require separate treat-

ment. This is particularly true, because President Wilson in waging war upon Germany made a strong point of criticizing the autocratic class system of government obtaining in that country (§§ 548-557) and because the form of government established in Russia has been constantly cited as one of the reasons why the United States has refused to recognize it.

When the German government appealed for peace in the autumn of 1918, President Wilson replied that he could not take the word of the present rulers in Germany and asked to hear from the German people. Not long afterwards the old autocratic class system was completely overthrown. The kaiser fled from the country, and the princely rulers of the several German states followed his example. Thereupon a republican form of government was adopted for each of the states and for the federation as a whole.

**1056. Germany a Democracy.** Arrangements were then made for giving the German people an equal voice in their government. The new federal constitution, adopted in 1919, conferred on all men and women over twenty years of age the right to vote. It provided that the president of the republic should be elected by popular vote for a term of seven years. In place of the old Imperial Council, it set up a National Council, or upper house of parliament, consisting of one representative from each of the small states and certain additional members from the larger states, on the basis of population. It continued the Reichstag, or lower house.

**1057. The New Prussian System.** In the general overturn Prussia was declared a republic. The three-class system of voting in that state (§ 550) was abolished, and a democratic constitution was adopted for that kingdom so long ruled by the Hohenzollerns. Equal suffrage was given to all men and women. The diet, or lower house of the Prussian legislature, was authorized to choose the premier, and the premier was empowered to select the members of his cabinet. The Prussian house of lords was abolished, and in its place was put a state council composed of members elected by local district assemblies. In a word, where the Hohenzollerns and the Junkers had once run things to suit themselves, there was founded a republic, governed by a parliament elected by the people



without any distinction between rich and poor. It looked as if the impossible had come to pass. But such are the pranks sometimes played by history on the great and masterful.

Going beyond these reforms in the old system, the Germans adopted a number of new devices for their federal union. They introduced proportional representation, as we have seen (§ 1053). They did not give the president the veto power over laws passed by the parliament, but allowed him to refer such laws to the voters for approval or rejection at the polls. Furthermore, they took over the principle of the initiative and referendum so extensively used in Switzerland and the western part of the United States. The new German constitution contains an article which permits one tenth of the qualified voters, by petition, to propose a law—that is, “initiate” it—and force the government to submit it to the people for their verdict at an election. If one twentieth of the voters dislike a law passed by the parliament, they may compel the government to refer it to the people for their judgment, on a “referendum.”

**1058. The Communistic System of Russia.** The new Russian constitution, adopted in 1918 and later amended in several details, presented a sharp contrast, as we have already hinted, to all the other constitutions of the world. In the first place, it abolished private property in land, declaring all land to be common property for the use of the people. It likewise “nationalized” all forests, mines, waterfalls, and factories; that is, added them to the railways already owned by the government. In short, it declared that the industries were all national property, and put the management of this property in the hands of commissions representing the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. It even attempted to close private stores and shops and transfer all that business to government officers.

**1059. The Russian Constitution.** Under the new constitution Russia was declared to be a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, binding together the various parts of the old Russian Empire that were left (§ 1033). Instead of giving the vote to all men and women alike, it expressly excluded from the suffrage merchants, employers, capitalists, and those living upon rent, interest, or profits. By a later decree, however, it was provided that such persons might

be allowed to vote if they could show that they were in fact living on an income derived from their own labor.

All governmental power in Russia was declared to be in the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, not elected directly, like the members of the House of Representatives in the United States, but indirectly by local councils or soviets of working people and peasants. This is a system of election similar in principle to that formerly applied to United States senators when they were chosen by the state legislatures—a system which the American people have declared to be undemocratic and have abandoned in favor of direct popular election by the voters.

The executive department of Russia, under this arrangement, consists of (1) a central executive committee elected by the Congress and (2) a council of people's commissaries which is in effect a cabinet with a president and with great departments, such as foreign affairs, war, finance, and transport. In theory the government grants freedom of opinion and conscience to all citizens, but in reality it is a dictatorship representing the few hundred thousand communists who control the army and the elections and hold the offices.

**1060. The Third International.** Besides setting up their own radical form of government, the Russian communists openly declared that they were working for a similar revolution in all the other countries of the world. Discontented with the Second International, to which the more moderate socialists of other nations belonged (§ 888), and calling it too mild in its theories and tactics, the Bolsheviki formed a Third International at Moscow in 1919. They condemned the "patriot" socialists who had supported their governments in the war, demanded a revolution in all the "capitalist" countries, called for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat in each, and urged the establishment of communism on the Russian model everywhere. Though the Third International won some adherents in other countries, it kept its headquarters in Moscow and was supported mainly by Russian money. This is also one of the reasons why the government of the United States has refused to recognize Russia.

## IV. THE SWING TO CONSERVATISM IN NORTHERN EUROPE

**1061. Russia tries to get down to Work.** It was one thing for the Bolsheviki to overturn the Tsar's government and issue paper proclamations declaring the land and factories to be public property; it was something entirely different for them to run railways, produce shoes, coats, and other goods, raise wheat, and do all the other things required for general prosperity. Moreover, after the first excitement was over, the leaders of the Bolsheviki saw that there was not to be an immediate uprising of the working classes all over the world as they had hoped. Indeed, the conservative newspapers in other countries continually reported that the Bolsheviki were about to be overthrown themselves. Nothing of the sort occurred, however. On the contrary, the "Red" army put down, one after another, the "White" military officers (Kolchak, Denekin, Yudenitch, and Wrangel), who attempted to restore the old order in Russia. By 1923, after the Bolsheviki had been in power for five years, it looked as if their tenure was fairly secure.

But they now had before them more difficult tasks than those of fighting. They had to run the factories, mines, ships, electric-light plants, banks, stores, and railways which they had seized—"nationalized," as they called it. This required engineering skill and ability in management; it could not be done by making speeches before cheering soviets. Besides being difficult in itself, the task was made doubly hard because Russian industries and railways had been badly worn out during the war and revolution, and as the Russian government had repudiated its debts, it could not borrow money abroad to repair the damages and buy new machinery. But something had to be done, for five sixths of the people were peasants in desperate need of clothing, shoes, plows, and other manufactured commodities. They demanded supplies at the hand of the soviet government, and the government stores and factories were simply unable to meet their demands.

**1062. The Bolsheviki compromise with Capitalism.** Thus the Bolsheviki had to surrender some of their communistic ideas. In fact, they adopted what they called a New Economic Policy—

"Nep" for short. They allowed private persons to open up stores and shops under government regulation; they cut down the power of workers' councils in government factories and sought to increase production by introducing stricter central management; they invited foreign capitalists to come into the country to develop mines, oil wells, and other industries, promising them to respect their property rights and allow them to earn good profits; they stopped the paper-money craze and adopted a specie currency. Instead of defying other countries as "capitalistic," the Soviet government tried to cultivate friendly relations and succeeded in winning recognition at the hands of Germany, Italy, France, England, Japan, and nearly all the powers of the world except the United States. While the government of Russia thus remained in the control of communists, and the Bolsheviki still talked of working-class uprisings in other lands, Russia was gradually drifting back, not toward the old feudal autocracy of the Tsar but in the direction of private enterprise. As a matter of fact, nearly all the people were peasants who owned the land they tilled and were not much concerned about the government so long as they could live with a fair degree of comfort.

**1063. The Middle Classes recover Power in Germany.** Although it looked as if the communists might come out on top in Germany during the disorders that followed the war, they were gradually suppressed. When the first elections were held under the new German constitution, it was found that while the Socialists and Communists (especially the former) were very strong, they did not have a majority of the people on their side. When the Socialist president, Friedrich Ebert, who had been put in power during the revolution, died in 1925, the new presidential election revealed the temper of the German people. The Socialist and Communist candidates together polled about 9,600,000 votes, whereas the Nationalists, standing for a restoration of the monarchy, Prussian dominance, and business enterprise polled over 10,000,000 votes. Since the remaining ballots were scattered among several candidates and no one received a majority, a second election was held, in which General Paul Hindenburg, the famous general of the World War,



came out victorious by a narrow margin. By this time the Dawes plan (see § 1081) had been put into force, the paper-money frenzy ended, and the industrial life of Germany returned to a capitalistic basis.

#### V. FASCISM: THE CONSERVATIVE REACTION IN ITALY

**1064. State of Italy in 1919.** Of all the countries that came out of the war victorious, Italy was the most disturbed by radical agitations. In that country the old Socialist party adopted communistic principles and in the election of 1919 carried six times as many cities and towns as in the previous election of 1913. Thus encouraged, Italian communists in several industrial centers came to the conclusion that the time was ripe to follow the Russian example. So they seized factories, expelled the proprietors, and proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat here and there in the manufacturing districts. Strange to say, the premier of Italy at the time, Giolitti, decided to shed no blood. He let the communists keep possession of the brick walls and machinery for several days until they learned that it took special talent to operate factories and to get markets for their goods.

**1065. Rise of the Fascisti under Benito Mussolini.** But the middle classes of Italy were not so cool as the government. They were dismayed by the threats of the communists and the disorders that had accompanied the recent progress of radicalism. Among the Italian citizens who watched the course of events was a young journalist, Benito Mussolini. Born in 1883, the son of an Italian blacksmith, Mussolini started life as a schoolmaster in Switzerland, where he went as a youth after receiving an education and a teacher's diploma in the land of his birth. In his new home he took up the study of socialism, adopted Marxian doctrines, and became a firebrand of an agitator. For his dangerous teachings he was expelled from Switzerland. Shortly after his return to Italy he became the editor of the leading socialist paper, the *Avanti*, and he was busily engaged in socialist propaganda when the World War crashed down upon humanity.

Mussolini almost immediately declared himself in favor of the *Entente* Allies against Germany. Breaking with the Socialist party, he threw himself into the agitation designed to force Italy into the war, and when war was declared the fiery young radical rushed into the army. Receiving a wound at the battle front, Mussolini returned to Milan, where he edited a patriotic newspaper.

Seeing the communists organizing in bands to seize factories and get possession of the government, and committing a good deal of violence and many murders in the operation, Mussolini decided to form a counter-movement. Hence in the spring of 1919 he began to organize, in opposition to the radicals, what he called Fascist Fighting Groups—taking the title from the Italian word *fasci*, referring to *fascies*, or bundles of rods, the symbol of unity and authority in ancient Rome. Before many months had passed, Italy was covered with a network of such societies dedicated to the self-chosen task of suppressing the followers of Lenin and the advocates of all forms of communism, socialism, and political democracy. They fell upon their foes, driving communist mayors and councilors out of office, beating, and killing, until they practically silenced the radicals in the name of Italian patriotism.

**1066. Mussolini becomes Dictator of Italy.** Finding their power daily increasing, the Fascisti, in October, 1922, held a great congress at Naples, where, forty thousand strong, they paraded the city in military formation, wearing black shirts, with Mussolini at their head. In a burst of enthusiasm Mussolini called upon the ministry to resign, threatening them with a march on Rome, where he proposed "to hand over to the king and army a renewed Italy." The cabinet wanted to declare martial law, but the king, fearing a revolution, called Mussolini to Rome and on October 30, 1922, made him prime minister. Thus installed in office, Mussolini summoned parliament and told the members, in effect, that if they did not give him dictatorial powers he would drive them out of the city. Like whipped children, they immediately conferred upon the dictator the authority of a Cæsar, to rule practically as he pleased. Without more ado Mussolini began to carry out the policies to which the Fascisti were pledged.

**1067. Fascist Principles.** Although there was no little difference of opinion among the Fascisti as to their program, in the course of the years after the establishment of their dictatorship they made it clear that they stood for at least three fundamental ideas:

1. First of all, they repudiated as flatly as did the Bolsheviki in Russia the doctrines of democratic government professed in England and America: namely, popular elections, majority rule, freedom of the press, and liberty of speech. The Italian parliament was allowed to continue; but the premier was made responsible only to the king (that is, in fact, to nobody but himself), and he was empowered to remain in office even if the parliament voted against him. No editor was allowed to publish a newspaper without the consent of the government; and if he criticized the government—that is, Mussolini—he was liable to have his paper seized and to be punished besides. While the central government was thus vested in the hands of one man, nearly all local governments were likewise brought under his direction. In more than two thirds of the towns and cities, including Rome, mayors and councils were set aside, and the management of affairs was turned over to officials appointed by the central government.

2. While abolishing democracy and self-government, the Fascisti also rejected both the Russian and the English idea of the proper relations for labor and capital. Russia declared that organized labor, the proletariat, should rule through a dictatorship. The Fascisti declared that while the laborers and peasants deserved sympathy, they were not intelligent enough to govern the country or run the factories. England followed the rule of allowing working people to organize unions freely and capitalists to form corporations and associations, and then letting the two sides struggle with each other over wages and hours, resorting to strikes and lockouts to enforce their demands. This theory the Fascisti utterly disclaimed. They provided for the organization of laborers in unions under government supervision, forbade strikes and lockouts, and ordered the settlement of all disputes between capital and labor by government courts of arbitration. The old Italian trade unions protested against this iron rule, saying that it was a scheme of employers to

enslave working people, but Mussolini paid no attention to their complaints. In short, the Fascisti demanded a coöperation of classes under the direction of the middle classes as superior in intelligence and capacity.

3. Departing from the Bolshevik idea that imperialism is a capitalist scheme for seizing other people's territory, the Fascisti adopted a kind of Pan-Italian creed, somewhat after the fashion of Pan-Germanism. They called attention to the glorious past of Italy when Rome ruled Europe from Arabia to Scotland. They pointed out the noble qualities of the Italian people. They lamented the fact that they were crowded into a little country, and declared that they must have colonies at all cost. They organized Fascist societies in various places where Italian emigrants had settled, including the United States, and federated them with the home societies to preserve Italian citizenship, Italian rights, and Italian culture.

To cheering multitudes Mussolini made eloquent speeches about "Greater Italy" and hinted at war, if necessary, to make a place for Italy in the sun. When, for example, some Italian officers serving on a boundary commission in Greece were brutally murdered, Mussolini sent an ultimatum to Greece as harsh as that sent to Serbia by Austria in 1914. Receiving an unsatisfactory answer, he seized the island of Corfu and bombarded the town of Corfu, killing fifteen or twenty innocent inhabitants. Not long afterwards he crossed over to Africa, as if to say to mankind that Italy regarded that part of the world as her rightful property, hinting that the French would do well to respect Italian claims to empire over there. Yet on occasion Mussolini praised peace and spoke about respecting the rights of his neighbors. But, whatever he said, there was no doubt that England and France looked with alarm on the possibility of a war in the Mediterranean as a result of Italy's colonial aspirations under Fascist government.

**1068. Military Dictatorship in Spain.** About a year after Mussolini made himself dictator in Rome a similar revolution occurred in Spain, which, like Italy, had been disturbed by strikes and labor agitations inspired, to some extent at least, by the revolt in Russia.



On top of these troubles came a war in Morocco, where the Spanish troops were badly defeated by the natives and Spain's portion of Morocco almost wrested from her. In these circumstances some discontented officers in the army laid the blame on the cabinet, seized Barcelona, and encouraged a general uprising in various provinces. Frightened by this display of force, the cabinet resigned, and King Alphonso called in the leader of the revolt, General Primo de Rivera, and asked him to assume the position of dictator. Parliament was then dissolved, and a committee of military officers was put in charge of the country. Freedom of the press was suspended, criticism of the government was severely punished, and such democracy as Spain had enjoyed was practically suppressed. Though outwardly the dictatorship of General de Rivera was akin to that of Mussolini, he had behind him no such organization as that of the Fascisti, and he undertook no such internal reforms.

## VI. GREAT BRITAIN AND HER SELF-GOVERNING EMPIRE

**1069. From Labor to Conservatism in Great Britain.** The traditional home of free speech, freedom of the press, and free agitation, England did not escape altogether the shock of revolution that jarred so many countries on the Continent. For many years there had existed in England a socialistic Labor party which advocated a peaceful change from capitalism to socialism (§ 844), and in the election of 1906 it had captured fifty seats in Parliament. During the World War there was a kind of truce between the British parties. Indeed, in 1915 the Liberals and Conservatives formed a coalition which remained in force until the armistice. At a general election held in 1918 while the war fever was still high, the coalition secured 467 seats, over two thirds of them belonging to the Conservatives.

But Lloyd George, who remained prime minister, had done his work; the coalition fell apart, and the Labor party, although it had at that time only 63 members, raised its voice against the feeble policy of the government. Lloyd George's cabinet resigned and was replaced by a Conservative group. Then the Conservatives decided

to "go to the country" by having a new election in November, 1922, in which they came off very well. Owing to the creation of the parliament of the Irish Free State (§ 1072) the number of members in the House of Commons had been reduced from 707 to 615. Of these seats the Conservatives won 344—well over half. The Liberals won only 114 seats, whereas the Labor party secured 142 members.

Being second in numbers, the Labor party became for the first time the recognized "opposition" party in Parliament. A year later (December, 1923) the prime minister, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, determined to have a general election on the ground that some form of protective tariff should be introduced to remedy the depression in business and the consequent widespread unemployment. This challenge to free trade, the historic doctrine of the Liberal party, resulted in rousing the Liberals to array themselves against the Conservatives along with the Labor party, and swept the Labor party into office. The Conservatives were reduced to 258 seats, while Labor rose to 191. Mr. Baldwin saw that he would not have the support of the House and recommended to the king that the opposition be asked to form a ministry.

**1070. Ministry of Ramsay Macdonald.** Accordingly, in January, 1924, the king, George V, asked Ramsay Macdonald, the most influential member of the Labor party, to form a cabinet, and thus a Labor government was installed in Great Britain. Knowing that it was a minority in the House of Commons and could live only with the support of the Liberals, the Macdonald government had to move cautiously. In no direction did it make any radical departures. Its scheme of taxation was no more extreme than that of Lloyd George adopted years before (§ 852). Its foreign policy in general was based on sympathy for distracted Europe, and Macdonald, as his own foreign minister, did his best to restore friendship among the war-worn countries across the Channel. Especially did he attempt to establish cordial relations with Russia by recognizing the Soviet government and to bring France and Germany together by encouraging the formation and adoption of the Dawes plan (§ 1081).

But Macdonald's Russian policy aroused great opposition among the Conservatives and Liberals, particularly his scheme for making a loan to Russia to help her toward restoring her industries. Realizing that the Liberals were unlikely to support him, Mr. Macdonald chose a less important issue as a test of his power—the so-called Campbell case. The editor of a communist weekly had been arrested for the publication of an article deemed seditious, but the attorney-general decided to withdraw the case. The Conservatives viewed this action as an interference with the course of justice and as due to pressure from the extreme element in the Labor party. A demand for an investigation into the matter was regarded by Mr. Macdonald as the equivalent of a vote of "lack of confidence" in his government, and he recommended that the king dissolve Parliament. The issue of the campaign turned on the hazards of socialistic government versus "security," and the Conservatives received a huge majority of votes. Mr. Stanley Baldwin again became premier.

**1071. Pacification of Ireland.** Far more disturbing to the British government than the agitations of the Labor party was the movement for Irish independence that flamed up during the World War. A temporary truce in the long struggle between England and Ireland, effected by the passage of the Home Rule law in 1914 (§ 867), was broken by the suspension of that law for the period of the war. Just as, a hundred years before, many Irish leaders had hoped that Napoleon would destroy the hated power of England, so, now, many of them looked to Germany. Certainly some of them entered into relations with German agents. At the same time a revolutionary movement broke out in Ireland under the direction of the republican, or Sinn Fein, party. The aim of this revolt was nothing short of complete independence and the establishment of an Irish republic. For five years, from 1916 to 1921, Ireland was in a state of insurrection. In January, 1919, the republicans proclaimed the independence of Ireland, and an Irish legislative body, the Dail Eireann, was created. It chose as president of the new republic Eamonn de Valera, a college professor. The new government was not recognized by Great Britain, and

there followed two years of assassinations, imprisonments, executions, and savage fighting between the Irish troops and the so-called "Black and Tans" sent over by the British to maintain order. For a time all attempts to reestablish peace seemed fruitless.

**1072. The Irish Free State.** At length a conference with the more moderate Irish republicans was arranged by Lloyd George. This met in London and worked out a form of Irish freedom. Article I of the treaty, concluded in December, 1921, reads: "Ireland shall have the same constitutional status in the community of nations known as the British Empire as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, with a Parliament having powers to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Ireland, and an executive responsible to that Parliament, and shall be styled and known as the Irish Free State." The new government was set up at Dublin, and the Irish Free State was admitted to the League of Nations.

Ulster refused to join with the south and was permitted to have its own "Government of Northern Ireland." The more extreme republicans continued to fight for the complete independence of Ireland, but it was hard to convince the British that it would be safe to have a power to the west which might make common cause with their enemies should war come. Ireland at last had Home Rule, but she was neither unified nor completely independent.

**1073. The British Commonwealth of Nations.** Signs of an independent spirit, such as filled Ireland with unrest, appeared in mild form in the five self-governing dominions of the British Empire (Canada, Newfoundland, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand), to say nothing of India, where special problems existed (§ 1100). It is true that the dominions cooperated loyally with the mother country during the war in Europe, but they indicated that they were helping as equals and of their own accord and not because they were bound as provinces of the Empire to render aid. Recognizing the changed temper in the colonies, the British premier, Lloyd George, invited the prime ministers of the self-governing dominions to meet in London in 1917 as a kind of "Im-



perial Cabinet." When they assembled, the representative of Canada said bluntly: "We meet here as equals. Ministers from six *nations* sit around the council board, all of them responsible to their respective parliaments." Four of the dominions were represented at the peace table in Paris and were admitted to the League of Nations as if they were independent countries; in fact, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, together with India and the Irish Free State, are now full-fledged members of the League, sharing power in its Assembly with the British Empire.

At imperial conferences held in 1921, 1923, and 1926 the idea of equality among the self-governing dominions was given a still more definite form. Indeed, on November 20, 1926, a kind of new constitution for the British Empire was issued by the conference of that year. The report declared that the title of the king should be changed so as to recognize Ireland and the British dominions beyond the seas as enjoying equality with Great Britain. It added that the governor-general sent out from London to each of the colonies should not be regarded as the agent of the British ministry but should stand in the same relation to the local parliament as the king himself to the Parliament in England. The general principle was adopted that the dominion legislatures were on an equal footing with the Parliament of Great Britain. It was also agreed that in some cases it might be desirable for self-governing dominions to send diplomatic representatives to foreign countries, and in keeping with that principle Canada appointed a minister to the United States. Carrying independence in foreign relations a step farther, a rule was drawn up to the effect that "neither Great Britain nor the Dominions could be committed to the acceptance of active obligations [by treaties with other nations] except with the definite assent of their own governments."<sup>1</sup>

**1074. The Present British Empire.** Certainly this created a most extraordinary state of affairs. The British Empire continued to exist. Perhaps the component states were as loyal to it as they

<sup>1</sup> The official text of the Report on the Reorganization of the British Empire is printed in *Current History* for January, 1927, pp. 564-569.

had been in the trying days of the war. But, beyond question, each of the states was feeling its way to greater independence. Nevertheless, no regular constitution was drawn up applying the federal principle, so long in operation in the United States, to the several parts of the Empire. In short, the self-governing parts of the British Empire have become "autonomous," and the great world-wide union is now a kind of voluntary association of states, held together by ties of interest, blood, and language. Whether this indicates for the future a steady weakening of the imperial bonds or a stronger federation based on liberty, time alone can tell. In any event it is one of the remarkable developments in interstate and international relations, to be studied in connection with the operation of the League of Nations at Geneva.

## VII. READJUSTMENTS IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

**1075. Attempts to stabilize Austria and Hungary.** The dissolution of the Austrian Empire was, as we have seen, one of the most striking results of the war. As the great conflict came to a close in 1918 the northern Slavs formed themselves into the republic of Czechoslovakia; the southern Slavs united as the kingdom of Yugoslavia; and Hungary, much reduced in size, became an independent state. Austria itself was converted into a small republic, with an area less than that of Ireland. Charles I, the successor of old Francis Joseph (who died in 1916), was unable to maintain himself as ruler either of Austria or of Hungary, and died in exile in 1922. Thus the rôle of the Hapsburgs, which had continued in European history for six centuries, was brought to an end.

Austria, which had been the center of the Empire, now that most of her former sources of revenue were cut off, found herself in a sad plight. Bankrupt, with no means of meeting the cost of her new government, she was unable to make the thorough reorganization necessary if she was to continue to exist as a republic.

After a three years' struggle against starvation and revolution, with her currency reduced to one-fifteen-thousandth part of its previous value and with no prospect of improvement, the League

of Nations devised a means by which she obtained a loan of a hundred and thirty-five million dollars, guaranteed by western European governments. In collaboration with the Austrian government a committee of the League undertook to rehabilitate the distracted state. Her financial affairs were straightened out, her currency was stabilized, and her income was made equal to her expenditures.




### THE AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC AND THE HUNGARIAN MONARCHY

In Hungary a very transient republic was established under the presidency of Count Karolyi, a statesman who, himself a great landowner, was eager to have the vast estates of Hungary divided among the peasants. His government was overthrown by a communist revolution, which was speedily succeeded by a counter-revolution (March, 1920) that brought Admiral Horthy into power as "regent" and frustrated all attempts to carry out much-needed land reforms. Hungary, unlike Austria, remained nominally a monarchy with a vacant throne.

In 1923 Hungary applied to the League for aid in restoring her financial situation. The Council appointed a committee which,






© Ewing Galloway, N. Y.

### HUNGARY'S TWENTIETH CENTURY LIMITED

The fastest express train on the line between Budapest and Trieste





© Ewing Galloway, N. Y.

GENOA, A GREAT ITALIAN SHIPPING CENTER

after studying the situation, arranged a reconstruction loan. This resulted in the balancing of the budget and even produced a surplus for 1924-1925. The financial affairs of Hungary were thus put in order by a commissioner-general working in coöperation with the League.

**1076. The Troublesome Balkans—Jugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.** Although it was one of the principal aims of President Wilson during the framing of the Versailles treaty to settle the age-old troubles of the Balkan countries by separating the races into distinct nations, his ideal was far from realized. In keeping with the theory that peoples of the same race should be given a government of their own, large sections of Austria and Hungary were united with Serbia to make "the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, known as Jugoslavia." But the new family was not very happy on the day of its union. Its various members were in remote origin of the same race, but for centuries they had been separated, living under different governments. As a result they differed widely among themselves in social, political, economic, and religious matters. In reality they were in some respects different peoples merely joined together by the fortunes of war under one king, Alexander.

The Croats complained that the Serbs monopolized the offices, laid unfair taxes, and did not give the other elements proportional representation in the parliament. The leader of the Serbs, holding the office of prime minister, had the leader of the Croats put into jail as a radical; after relenting and letting him out the premier continued to insist that the management of affairs should belong to the Serbian element in the population. It took a great deal of skillful maneuvering to keep peace in the new kingdom, but after the lapse of a few years it seemed that at least a working unity had been obtained. Possessing a rich territory and an industrious peasantry, Jugoslavia gave promise of becoming a power of great strength in the Balkans. In dealing with Italy its government showed decided moderation. When the Italians claimed Fiume as their port, the Jugoslavs compromised by yielding to the claim and accepting the neighboring port of Baros instead.

**1077. Situation in Bulgaria.** The troubles of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were slight compared with those of their neighbors on the east, the Bulgarians. To punish Bulgaria for entering the war on the side of the Central Powers, the Allies, as we have noted, transferred to Jugoslavia certain border districts and cut her off from the Ægean Sea by depriving her of Western Thrace. Moreover, they awarded to Rumania the rich farm lands of the upper Dobrudja, between the Danube and the Black Sea. Saddled with a heavy debt and long oppressed by a military and monarchist party in the capital, Sofia, the peasants of Bulgaria, inspired perhaps by the Russian example, formed a peasant party and got possession of the government for a time. This produced a reaction against them, ending in the murder of their leader, in a great deal of disorder, and finally, in 1923, in the establishment of a military dictatorship representing the middle classes and the militarists. Martial law was introduced, the communist party was dissolved, and the power of the peasantry was broken.

**1078. Rumania.** Bulgaria's northern neighbor, Rumania, though overwhelmed by the Germans in the war, emerged from the struggle with a territory twice as big as the old kingdom. Besides Rumanians this "greater Rumania" now included Serbs, Hungarians, Russians, Bulgarians, and Turks, to say nothing of the large Jewish population long held in subjection. Frightened by the peasant revolution in Russia, the royal government promised to break up the great estates and give land to the peasants, but as time went on the middle classes and military men got a strong grip on things and stopped this reform. Communists and agitators were put in jail. Jews were deprived of civic equality. Indeed there was so much disputing in the new kingdom and so much poverty that American bankers declined to risk lending any money to the Rumanian government, much as they were pleased to meet the Rumanian queen, Marie, when she visited the United States in 1926.

**1079. Turkey and Greece.** While the Serbs, Bulgars, and Rumanians, whom the Turks had once ruled, were trying to set their houses in order, the once magnificent Ottoman Empire, now



reduced to a shadow, attempted to modernize itself. As we have seen, at the close of the Balkan wars in 1913 the possessions of Turkey in Europe had been reduced to Constantinople and a little patch to the west, known as Eastern Thrace. During the World War, by various methods, Egypt,<sup>1</sup> the Hejaz, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine escaped altogether from Turkish control.

When the armistice was concluded, the Allies demanded that Turkey give up her chief seaport, Smyrna, as well as Eastern Thrace, to the Greeks. This action, as we have seen, aroused a nationalist movement in Turkey under a vigorous leader, Mustapha Kemal Pasha, who made Angora, not Constantinople, the headquarters of the new government. The Nationalists refused to recognize the settlement which the Sultan made with the Allies. Kemal's army repulsed the Greeks, who had marched into Asia Minor from Smyrna. The Turkish Nationalists received a certain support from Italy and France, whose business men hoped to gain oil and trade concessions.

After the expulsion of the Greeks the Turkish Nationalists stood firmly for what they considered their rights. The Treaty of Lausanne (July, 1923) with the Allies recognized Turkey's possession of Smyrna, Constantinople, and Eastern Thrace (§ 1032). The Nationalists then forced the Sultan to leave Constantinople, and in October, 1923, they established a Turkish republic, with its capital at Angora. A few months later the members of the House of Osman, which had ruled the Turks for seven centuries, were exiled and went the way of the Hohenzollerns, Hapsburgs, and Romanoffs. The caliphate was abolished on the ground that the Turks repudiated the ancient combination of religion and politics and that the Moslems no longer needed an intermediary between themselves and Allah.

<sup>1</sup> Egypt, long under British dominion, broke off all relations with Turkey during the World War, and then sent delegates to the Paris peace conference to demand independence from the protectorate imposed on the country by the British government. Meanwhile nationalist agitations broke out in various sections of Egypt. Early in 1922 England announced that independence would be granted, and the next year Egypt was declared to be a sovereign state with a hereditary monarchy and a parliament—subject to certain reservations protecting British interests.



Although the Greeks had entered the World War late, they kept on fighting the Turks after its close, with the hope of getting Smyrna and Eastern Thrace. The Allies, who for a time had encouraged these aggressions, finally thought best to make terms with the new Turkish government at Angora. Now deserted, the Greeks were quickly beaten in war, and thereupon they attributed their military failure to their sovereign and to his ministers. In March, 1924, the monarchy was abolished and a republic was set up.

### QUESTIONS

I. Why was it so difficult to restore prosperity in Europe? What did the war cost in lives and wealth? Describe the "inflation" of the currency. Why did it make business difficult? How did the war demoralize industry? Account for the troubles incurred in starting new governments. Explain the unrest in Russia, Germany, and Austria. What difficulties did the communists and peasants make?

II. Show how the new constitutions in Europe generally advanced democratic principles. What gains were made for woman suffrage? Explain "parliamentary" and "presidential" government. What system did the Germans adopt? What is the purpose of proportional representation? Describe the socialistic features of the new constitutions.

III. Why are the German and Russian constitutions of particular interest to American people? Compare the old and the new German system of government. Contrast the present Prussian constitution with the former three-class system. What is the German plan of initiative and referendum? What are the chief provisions of the Russian constitution with respect to private property in land and industry? in merchandising? How does that constitution depart from the principle of equality in suffrage? Explain "indirect election." Compare the Third International with the Second International. Why is the former primarily a Russian organization?

IV. What have been the recent tendencies in Soviet Russia? Can you prove that Germany is growing more conservative?

V. What was the state of Italy at the close of the World War? Give a sketch of Mussolini's life. What is the origin of the word "Fascism"? How did Mussolini become dictator of Italy? Give some of the fundamental ideas of Fascism. Contrast the dictatorship in Spain with that in Italy.

VI. How do you account for the formation of a Labor government in England? What happened to it? Describe the settlement of the Irish question. Show how the spirit of independence is growing in the self-governing states of the British Empire.

VII. Describe the dissolution of the Hapsburg empire. What is the present status of Austria and Hungary? Give some of the problems of the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes. Account for the troubles of Bulgaria. How do racial questions add to the perplexities of Rumania? What was the effect of the World War on Turkey? on Greece? Show how the Turkish Nationalists have been attempting to modernize their country. What is the present status of Egypt?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Supplementary. HAYES, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe* (Revised Edition, 1924), Vol. II: (1) economic and social difficulties, pp. 834-843; (2) nationalism and imperialism in the new era, pp. 843-853; (3) spread of democracy and republicanism, pp. 853-862.

## CHAPTER XXXIII

### READJUSTING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS


#### I. THE QUESTION OF GERMAN REPARATIONS

##### 1080. Difficulty of carrying out the Treaty of Versailles.

The severe terms imposed on Germany by the Versailles treaty were not easy to carry out. Holland refused to surrender the kaiser for trial, as had been ordered by the Allies, and practically all the Germans accused of high crimes and misdemeanors in connection with the war escaped punishment. As a matter of fact, when the charges of "atrocities" against the Germans were sifted, nearly all of them were found to be mere rumors or gross exaggerations.

The most vexatious question was the amount of the damages, or "reparations," that the Germans were to pay. In the treaty of peace the total sum had been left indefinite, to be determined later by a reparations commission representing the victors. After much argument the bill was fixed in 1921 at thirty-three billion dollars—a staggering sum which the German government declared impossible of payment, even in installments extending over a period of forty-two years. A deadlock followed. Then the Allies proposed a reduction, but the German government insisted that it could not pay more than twelve and one-half billion dollars. Great Britain suggested a compromise. France and Belgium stood firm for every penny. Impatient at delay, in January, 1923, they ordered their troops to invade the industrial region of Germany beyond the Rhine, especially the cities in the Ruhr valley, with instructions to collect from Germany by force if necessary. The Germans resisted, and the operation proved to be a failure. Meanwhile the German currency was being blown up to the bursting point by inflation (§ 1035).

During the height of this controversy Charles E. Hughes, the American Secretary of State, suggested in a public speech that



© Ewing Galloway, N.Y.

## A GREAT POWER PLANT IN GERMANY

A substitute for coal lost in the war





© Ewing Galloway, N.Y.

MODERN AGRICULTURE IN GERMANY

quarreling and fighting would not solve the problem and hinted that a committee of expert businessmen should be appointed to draw up a plan for disposing of the reparations issue. In November, 1923, after long negotiations, the reparations commission appointed two such committees of experts, one of them headed by General Charles G. Dawes, former Director of the Budget of the United States and later vice president. In due time a report known as "the Dawes plan" was drawn up, approved by the Allied governments, accepted by Germany, and put into effect in the autumn of 1924.

**1081. The Dawes Plan.** Involving as it did enormous sums of money, the Dawes plan was naturally very long and very complex, but certain general principles were embodied in it. First of all, it was based on the idea of restoring the independence of Germany by the speedy withdrawal of foreign soldiers from her soil. Secondly, it provided that the inflation of the currency should stop and a new monetary system be installed. In the third place, it created a new German bank under the supervision of the Allied powers to manage the business of collecting the reparations. Finally, it stipulated that, beginning in 1924, the German government should pay into this bank a certain sum of money annually, rising to a "normal" sum of two and a half billion marks annually by 1928-1929, and that the bank should in turn distribute the money so received among the Allies according to a scheme of percentages already agreed upon. For the first year four fifths of the amount paid into the bank was derived from a foreign loan, most of which was floated in the United States; that is, by bonds sold to American citizens.

The immediate effect of the adoption of the Dawes plan was to restore confidence in Europe and to stop the futile bickering about reparations that had been going on for six years. Nobody was exactly satisfied with it, but nearly everyone agreed that it was the best and fairest scheme yet proposed. How it will work out, however, remains uncertain. The real test will come in 1929, when the larger payments begin. Many Germans say that the bill is too great and cannot be paid. Practical business men suggest waiting to see what will happen when pay day comes.

## II. THE QUESTION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY

**1082. Dangers of New Wars.** In spite of the victory of the Allies and the establishment of the League of Nations, none of the recently warring countries felt altogether certain about the future. Though triumphant over Germany for the moment, France knew that her population was smaller than Germany's, and that if Germany got on her feet the day of revenge might be dreadful, unless France could draw upon her African colonies for negro troops to fight her battles. With Russia out of the field, France had no powerful ally she could depend upon. On the other hand, Germany, disarmed and subjected to French invasion, was in a bad plight; and, bad as it was, it could be made worse if France and Belgium insisted on collecting reparations with bayonets.

Nor was the position of the new states to the east much better. They were nominally independent; but, standing alone as they did, they were weak against either Germany or Russia. It is true that Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, and Rumania united in forming "the Little Entente" and that France and Poland joined them, but at best such a union offered no assurance of peace to distracted Europe. In other words, the various nations on the Continent were busy making treaties and combinations looking to defense and war and were daily adding to their outlays for guns, munitions, forts, and armies. Even England, once safe on her island home and still mistress of the seas, stirred restlessly amid the new dangers. Her commerce was badly deranged by the turmoil on the Continent, and the growth of the French airplane service for military purposes made her wonder whether her sea power was not obsolete. Clearly, unless something was done to restore confidence and guarantee security, a ruinous war might break out any time.

**1083. The Locarno Conference.** As Carlyle says, when it gets dark enough we can see stars. When Europe seemed on the edge of ruin, and after innumerable "conversations" and exchanges of notes, a great conference was opened at Locarno in Switzerland on October 5, 1925. It was attended by the representatives of France, Belgium, Great Britain, Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and



Italy. Its purpose was to discuss the question of security which had been agitating Western nations since the close of the World War. For the first time since 1914 Germany became a party to an international conference for the maintenance of peace and was received on a friendly footing with the other nations in a common enterprise. To ease the strain, the delegates took boat rides together on the neighboring lake and made automobile tours together in the surrounding country. At the end of twelve days' discussion Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, and Italy signed a Treaty of Mutual Guaranty, commonly called the Security Pact, and six other treaties in the interest of peace and arbitration were agreed to.

1084. **The Locarno Security Pact.** By the terms of the Security Pact the powers bind themselves to maintain the frontiers between Germany and Belgium and between Germany and France, as provided in the Treaty of Versailles. They also agree, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty, to continue the peace zone extending between the western border of Germany and a line fifty kilometers east of the river Rhine. In that "demilitarized zone" Germany is not to maintain armed forces nor mobilize troops. As a further guaranty Germany and France pledge themselves not to attack each other or to invade each other's territory or to resort to war against each other. A similar pledge is made by Germany



MAP OF THE PEACE ZONE



and Belgium. More than that: if a dispute arises between them, they are bound to settle it peaceably; if they cannot agree, then they are to submit the question in debate to arbitration and finally, if necessary, to the Council of the League of Nations.

Should one of the five countries refuse to abide by the general agreement and actually make war on any of the others, then all the other signers of the Pact are pledged to come immediately to the aid of the party attacked. Moreover both parties to any dispute agree to accept the decision of the Council of the League if the other countries are unanimous in their opinion. Article 5 deals with "aggression" and is therefore the vital part of the treaty with respect to the prevention of war. It defines aggression as the refusal to accept the decision of the various international courts on legal matters or the decision of conciliation tribunals on other matters (see § 1090).

**1085. The Arbitration Treaties.** The Locarno Security Pact was supplemented by arbitration treaties between Germany and France, Germany and Belgium, Germany and Poland, and Germany and Czechoslovakia. These treaties provide that all disputes which cannot be settled by an exchange of views may be, and in some cases shall be, submitted to a Permanent Conciliation Commission, to be composed of one citizen from each of the countries engaged in the dispute and three citizens from other countries not directly concerned in the quarrel. If no peaceful agreement can be reached by this commission, then the case is to be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice, known as the World Court, established by the League of Nations (§ 1087).

Another interesting departure was made in two other treaties signed at the same time. France and Poland openly agreed to aid each other if Germany violates the Security Pact and attacks either one, and France and Czechoslovakia made a similar promise. Thus, instead of secret treaties such as existed between France and Russia in 1914, concerning which Germany then knew very little, there are now open treaties giving Germany to understand just what she may expect in case another grave dispute arises.

The Locarno treaties mark a new era in international relations

and are regarded by some as the beginning of a series of such conventions which may break down old barriers between nations and perhaps lead in time to something like a federation of the states of Europe. However this may be, the Locarno settlement is unique in many ways. In the first place, the Security Pact is notable for its simplicity and directness and for making no concessions to "national honor." The signatories pledge themselves to cooperate to maintain peace rather than to establish, as of old, a defensive alliance against a real or an imaginary enemy. This is not a secret treaty to preserve the "balance of power," but a frank and published agreement to "seek peace and pursue it." Furthermore, the parties chiefly concerned associate with themselves other nations as guarantors to see that their contracts are kept. Above all, they voluntarily promise to submit their future disputes to a third party—a commission, a court, or a council—and to abide by the decision of this body.

### III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

**1086. Organization and Work of the League.** According to the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, the League of Nations was duly organized and in November, 1920, held its first session at Geneva. On this occasion there were present the representatives of the forty-two nations then enrolled in the League. At the end of five years the membership had risen to fifty-five. In 1926 Germany was received into the fellowship with great cordiality, leaving outside this "Parliament of Man" six countries—Russia, the United States, Turkey, Egypt, Ecuador, and Mexico, to which were added the Argentine Republic, Spain, and Brazil, which had withdrawn after joining the League. From time to time, as required by the Constitution of the League, meetings of the Assembly and the Council were held, important matters decided, and numerous commissions appointed to make investigations and to carry out the orders of the League.

In several ways the League has promoted the peace of Europe. In the first place, it has been able to avert serious trouble between

its members by settling a number of controversies arising over conflicting claims to territory. War between Italy and Greece and between Greece and Bulgaria was fended off by the intervention of the League. Relief work for refugees from war-devastated areas has been carried out on a large scale by its commissions, and aid and advice in financial reconstruction have been given, notably to Austria and Hungary. Permanent auxiliary departments for the prolonged study of important questions have been organized. These departments are of two kinds: technical bodies dealing with finance and economics, transit and health; advisory committees occupied with military questions, disarmament, mandates, traffic in women and children, opium, and intellectual coöperation. In addition, two related but practically independent bodies have been established: the International Labor Organization and the Permanent Court of International Justice.

**1087. The Permanent Court of International Justice, or World Court.** One of the most notable accomplishments of the League has been the establishing of the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant. This is commonly known as the World Court. In February, 1920, the Council appointed a committee of jurists of international reputation to draw up a plan for the proposed court.<sup>1</sup> This committee prepared a draft-statute which with some amendments was approved by the Assembly in December of the same year. The statute was then embodied in a protocol, or treaty, which was to be signed by nations wishing to become members of the Court and was left open for the signature of those countries which later decided to join. When the Assembly met the following year (December, 1921), twenty-eight countries had ratified the treaty, which then went into effect. The Court held its first session at The Hague on January 30, 1922. By the end of 1926 forty-eight members were enrolled in the Court.

It must be noted that the Permanent Court of International Jus-

<sup>1</sup> Among the members of this committee was Mr. Elihu Root, former Secretary of State, who acted in a *personal* capacity and not as the *official* representative of the United States.

tice is in addition to the Court of Arbitration, which was organized at the Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 (§ 924). The Permanent Court, or World Court, consists of fifteen judges, who are elected by the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations. They are to serve for nine years and may be reëlected. The seat of the Court is at The Hague, and sessions are to be held each year, continuing until all cases in hand are settled.

In general the nations which have joined the Court are not bound to submit all cases in dispute to the Court, but they may do it *voluntarily* if they so desire. However, they may, by signing a special agreement, bind themselves to accept the jurisdiction of the Court as *obligatory* in all disputes concerning (1) the interpretation of a treaty; (2) any question of international law; (3) the existence of any fact which, if established, would be considered a breach of international law; (4) the nature and extent of the damages to be paid, or reparation made, for such a breach of international obligation.

Of the forty-eight states that have joined the World Court twenty-three have accepted the obligatory jurisdiction of the Court.

**1088. Contrast between the World Court and the Hague Tribunal.** The first serious discussions of an international court took place, as we have seen, at the Hague conferences (§ 924). The nations, however, wished to retain their complete independence and to submit only such questions as they saw fit. They refused to consider seriously *compulsory* arbitration. The result was the founding of the Hague Court of Arbitration, which consisted of a list of judges chosen by the nations meeting at the conferences, from which a tribunal was to be selected for each case that came up. The Court was established at The Hague and was presented with a handsome building called the Peace Palace, the gift of Mr. Andrew Carnegie. The Hague Court of Arbitration differs from the World Court (also established at The Hague) in a number of fundamental points. The Hague Court is a court of *arbitration* which seeks to adjust disputes through compromise; the World Court, on the other hand, is a court of law whose decisions and



advisory opinions are based on legal rules. The Hague Court lacks continuity in its work, since its judges change from time to time; the World Court, composed of judges who devote all their attention to the Court, promises by its continued practice to build up a new body of international law.<sup>1</sup>

**1089. Disarmament Projects.** The most difficult problem which the League has had to face is the question of disarmament. Any attempt to persuade a nation to reduce the military forces on which it has been wont to depend for protection arouses all the old-time fears and suspicions and is met with strong opposition. This is not due to perversity but to a feeling that it is not safe to disarm. The third Assembly of the League recognized the principle that the two problems of *disarmament* and *security* are inseparable; it is not possible to expect a nation which is in danger of attack to reduce its armaments without falling back upon some guaranty of security, such as the promise, in the Covenant, of help if attacked (Article 16). The Hague conferences called for the purpose of disarmament failed, and the Washington Conference of 1921, although it established a set ratio of strength for battle-ships, did not regulate land armaments and failed to do more than denounce the most effective method of destruction—chemical warfare (§ 1096).

**1090. Plans for Peace; the Pact of Paris.** The difficulties of disarmament led to the search for other means of insuring peace, such as compulsory arbitration and the *outlawing* or *renunciation* of war. A number of plans were brought before the League. In 1924 a Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance was accepted by some members of the League but rejected by others. Its main feature was that *it declared aggressive war a crime*. The signatories were to assist the victims of "aggressive" war and were also to reduce their armaments in proportion to the security offered by the treaty. But the word "aggressive" was not defined. In the so-called American plan drawn up by an unofficial committee of Ameri-

<sup>1</sup> Among the judges who were chosen for the World Court in September, 1921, was Professor John Bassett Moore, a distinguished American authority on international law.

cans an *aggressor* was defined as one who goes to war without obeying a summons to an appropriate international tribunal or refuses to accept the unanimous decision of the Council.

These two plans became the basis of the Geneva Protocol of the Assembly of 1924, which declared aggressive war to be a crime and stated that a nation is an aggressor when it refuses the alternatives of war. It also provided for the peaceful settlement of all disputes through compulsory arbitration. Although self-defense was regarded as legitimate, it was not to be based on the individual judgment of a party to a controversy. The Protocol called upon the members of the League to come to the assistance of a nation that is attacked. The British government declined to accept the Protocol, urging that a *general* obligation to assist a victim of aggression would put too heavy a burden upon a world empire so long as the United States was not included in the League. It suggested that a more satisfactory solution would be to supplement the Covenant of the League by special peace treaties between those nations whose differences might lead to war. This idea was followed at the Locarno Conference (§ 1083).

A great step toward the achievement of world peace was taken when, on the tenth anniversary of the entrance of the United States into the World War, M. Briand proposed that the friendship of the United States and France be made perpetual by a treaty outlawing war between them. This was followed by a formal proposal for such a treaty by the French government. In his reply the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, suggested that a more effective means of promoting world peace would be to secure the adherence of the six principal powers of the world to a declaration condemning recourse to war. Following the wishes of Great Britain and France, the British dominions and all the countries that had signed the Locarno agreement were also invited to participate. Finally, on August 27, 1928, the representatives of fifteen nations met at Paris and pledged themselves to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to seek the settlement of future disputes with one another only by pacific means. This is properly known as the Pact of Paris, but in the United States is called the Kellogg Treaty.

## IV. WHAT OF THE FUTURE IN EUROPE?

**1091. Discontent in Germany over the Territorial Settlement of Versailles.** While the German government faithfully fulfilled the terms of the Dawes plan, and signed the treaties drawn up at the Locarno Conference, it would be a mistake to assume that the German nation is satisfied with the state of affairs in which Germany finds herself. Taking the election returns as a basis of opinion, an overwhelming majority of the German people agree in protesting against the arrangements made at Versailles. Just as the French in Lorraine once complained about their plight under the German government, so now the Germans in Alsace complain about their lot under the French government, to which they were subjected by the treaty makers. In the settlement of 1919, which was supposed to do justice to races and minorities, one million Germans were added to Poland, three million were included in Czechoslovakia, and three or four million were scattered among the peoples of France, Italy, and other neighboring countries. Just as the Germans once tried to denationalize the Poles, so now the Poles and Italians try to suppress the Germans. Whatever the merits of the several racial claims, the germs of future trouble lie in the pleas of racial minorities for their "rights."

**1092. The German Colonial Issue.** Among the famous Fourteen Points declaring the American war policy as interpreted by President Wilson was one calling for "a free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims," with due respect for the rights of natives. Now this "point" was interpreted in Germany as implying the possible return of the colonies which had been seized during the struggle. But in the Versailles settlement nothing of the sort was done. The former German colonies were divided among the British Empire, France, and Japan as "mandates" held in trust under the League of Nations. Besides declaring this to be a breach of faith, many Germans demanded the colonies back as necessary to the support of the industries of their country. Broad hints have been made that the issue might in time be brought up before the League of Nations.

**1093. German Protests against War Guilt.** Perhaps the greatest of the German grievances arises from Article 231 of the Versailles treaty, which declares in effect that Germany and her allies must accept full responsibility for the aggression that caused the war and for all its damages. To this assertion the Germans make many objections. They claim that Germany was not solely responsible for starting the conflict; that, on the contrary, England, France, and Russia were bound in a secret alliance, made preparations for war just as feverishly as did Germany, and, far from trying to stop the war, helped to bring it on. Moreover, they add, Germany was trying hard to restrain Austria when the Russians mobilized and gave the signal for the fighting to begin. Some Germans seek to throw the chief responsibility on Russia; others say that France's desire for revenge was the main cause; perhaps all of them agree that in any event all the great powers were to blame in some measure. From this line of reasoning it follows that Germany should not be treated as a guilty outlaw and be forced to pay heavily for damages which were incurred in the general conflict. Although neutral historians differ among themselves on this question, probably there are very few who would now place on Germany or her allies the *sole* responsibility for starting the war. In any case, Germany will not rest content with the verdict of "guilty" pronounced in Article 231 of the Versailles treaty.

**1094. Italy's Place in the Sun.** Almost equally discontented over the distribution of colonies and territories are the imperialists in Italy. With a population larger than that of France, Italy has only about half France's area in square miles. Moreover, Italy is poor in natural resources—coal, iron, and other minerals. Like the Pan-Germans before the World War, the Italian imperialists insist that they too must have colonies. They chafe at the predominance of the British naval power in the Mediterranean and look with hungry eyes upon the large colonies held in Africa by their neighbors, the French.

**1095. Russia's Peculiar Position.** Professing hatred for the "capitalist civilization" of other countries, the Soviet government of Russia remains an uncertain factor in the European "concert of



powers." At first the other countries refused to have anything to do with revolutionary Russia; some of them, including the United States, sent soldiers into Russian territory and waged war on the Bolsheviki. When attempts to overthrow them failed, efforts were made to stifle them by drawing a cordon round them and refusing to recognize their government. Finally that policy was given up, and one country after another, as we have seen, made treaties with Russia, the United States remaining the only great power which steadily refused to do anything of the kind. But still Russia was not taken into the League of Nations, and the Bolsheviki kept on making trouble for their neighbors by threats of revolution. It could hardly be said that Europe had returned to a normal course while that great country remained outside the family of nations.

## V. RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH EUROPE

**1096. The Washington Conference.** The rejection of the League of Nations by the United States Senate did not prevent efforts on the part of the United States government to reduce the chances of new hostilities. On the contrary, Senator Borah, one of the leaders among the opposition to the League, proposed in Congress a resolution asking President Harding to call a new conference of the nations at Washington to consider the reduction of armaments. A resolution to this effect was carried, and the call duly went forth. On November 12, 1921, delegates from the United States, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Portugal met in Washington. For nearly three months they discussed problems of armaments and international relations.

The results of the Conference were embodied in treaties and resolutions. A treaty was made between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, providing specifically that their battleships were to be reduced in number and limited for a period of ten years. By another agreement, known as the Four-Power Treaty, the United States, the British Empire, France, and Japan bound themselves to respect one another's island posses-

sions in the Pacific (not including the main islands of Japan) and to hold consultations whenever controversies should arise with respect to them. A third treaty bound each of the powers represented at Washington to respect the sovereignty of China and to refrain from seeking special rights and privileges in that country to the injury of the rights of citizens and subjects of other states. An arrangement was made for terminating the Anglo-Japanese alliance (§ 931), long a matter of grave concern to the government of the United States in its Far Eastern affairs. The Japanese and Chinese, whose relations were very strained, were brought together. A step was taken toward the settlement of the dispute over Shantung (§ 1037), from which Japan agreed to withdraw at a definite time, on specified conditions—among them that China should pay more than fifty million gold marks to Japan for the property taken by Japan from the Germans. A number of additional decisions respecting the management of China's affairs were made by the Conference.

All these arrangements, it will be seen, relate to the settlement of specific matters. The sponsors of the Conference, President Harding and his Secretary of State, Charles E. Hughes, were careful to caution the American people against expecting general disarmament or any grand plan for universal peace. As President Harding pointed out in one of his addresses, with Europe prostrate and penitent no one feared the likelihood of early conflict there. But the Pacific had its menaces, and they deeply concerned us. The Washington Conference, therefore, did not discuss any great designs for universal peace, but sought to cut down the expenses for battleship-building and to reach agreements over matters of territory and trade likely to involve the various nations in more wars. Whether this method of handling international affairs proves to be more successful than Hague conferences and meetings of the League of Nations, time alone can tell. All the world must at least share the hope, so earnestly expressed by President Harding, that the Washington agreements have advanced international peace and reduced the chances of renewed hostilities, especially with respect to control over the Pacific islands.

**1097. European Debts due the United States.** After the government of the United States declared war on Germany it lent huge sums of money to the countries associated with it,—in all to twenty different countries,—particularly to England, France, Italy, Belgium, Poland, and Russia. The war loans were later supplemented by loans for relieving suffering and helping to restore business. All in all these sums amounted to more than ten billion dollars, which was procured by the United States government by selling Liberty bonds to its citizens and by taxing them.

Finally there came a day of reckoning. While a great many American citizens argued that these debts should be canceled, since the money was spent in a common cause, the Congress of the United States insisted that they should be collected. One or two loans were repaid in full; for example, Cuba had borrowed ten million dollars and paid it off promptly. One by one agreements were made with the other debtors, until by 1926 thirteen of the twenty had made promises to pay a definite amount each year until a fixed sum was discharged. Russia, however, had not taken any steps looking toward settlement by that time, and the French parliament had declined to ratify the contract already made. In general the hardest bargain was driven with Great Britain; but in no case was any country called upon to pay the full amount with interest at the rate paid by the Federal government on its Liberty bonds; namely,  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. In fact, the rate of interest charged to Belgium was 1.8, to France 1.6, and to Italy 0.4. Whether these sums would ever be met in full remained as uncertain as the payment of German reparations. Evidently a great many things can happen by 1984, when England's last installment falls due.

**1098. New European Debts created in the United States.** Besides the debts owed by European governments to the government of the United States, new problems were raised by additional borrowings made in this country for European governments, cities, and business enterprises. These latter loans differ from the former, however, in that they are made by private American citizens who are willing to risk money in European bonds because they pay a higher rate of interest than domestic loans—in some cases 8 or 10

per cent. By the end of 1926 American citizens had over two billion dollars invested in European stocks and bonds, and the amount was increasing by leaps and bounds. Indeed, there was hardly a country or important city on the continent of Europe, to say nothing of European factory owners, railways, and business firms, that did not owe money to American citizens. According to one reckoning these private loans will, at the present rate of increase, reach the total of six billion dollars by 1936. In any case this investment of American capital in Europe and the distribution of foreign bonds all over America among small investors will form new ties of connection with European affairs during the coming years. What would happen, for example, if another war in Europe should end in a wholesale repudiation of indebtedness, as in the case of Russia, Germany, and Austria in 1917-1918?

**1099. The United States and the World Court.** Having many close connections with Europe, in spite of its refusal to join the League of Nations, and professing always to desire a peaceful settlement of international disputes, the United States had to consider the question of joining the World Court established by the League (§ 1087). A large number of American citizens urged this action on the government. On February 24, 1923, President Harding proposed the acceptance of the Protocol by the United States, but with the following reservations formulated by Secretary Hughes: That the United States should not become involved in any legal relation with the League of Nations or assume any obligations under its Covenant; that the United States should participate in the election of judges; that the United States should pay a fair proportion of the expenses of the Court; that the statute of the Court should not be amended without the consent of the United States.

Late in 1925 President Coolidge indorsed the Court, and then the question of the entry of the United States was warmly debated in Congress. Finally, on January 27, 1926, the Senate ratified the proposal with practically the same reservations as those made by Secretary Hughes. An additional reservation, however, stated that the Court is not to render an advisory opinion "touching any dis-



pute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest" without the consent of the United States. Furthermore, the United States will not join the Court unless all the other members of the Court accept the reservations made by the Senate and agree to abide by them.

Although the action of the Senate in approving the proposition of the President to join the World Court was hailed by some American citizens as an important step in the direction of permanent international peace, it was at best a very uncertain step. The United States agreed to join only after laying down a number of conditions and declaring that all the other nations in the Court must agree to them. To get all those nations to agree to such conditions was not easy. Indeed, they were slow to move in the matter. By the autumn of 1926 a few small nations, including Cuba and Albania, had accepted the reservations of the United States, but at a conference of the powers in Geneva in September, 1926, it was made clear that the other countries were not willing to agree to all the terms laid down in the reservations. Shortly afterwards President Coolidge declared that he would not ask the Senate to modify its reservations, and it appeared to be doubtful whether the United States would after all enter the World Court.

## VI. EUROPE AND THE ORIENT

**1100. Discontent in India.** One of the "points" in President Wilson's program was the right of each nationality to determine its own destiny. Acting on this principle, dissatisfied natives in India demanded independence from Great Britain. During the World War Indian princes and their troops came loyally to the aid of their emperor, the British king, but meanwhile a powerful agitation for Indian freedom was begun. For a time it looked as if India were on the verge of a revolution. So alarmed was the British government that it had many agitators arrested and imprisoned or shot; it broke up mass meetings, and on one occasion killed several hundred people. One section of the natives, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, started a remarkable

“nonresistance” movement by pledging members not to cooperate with the British authorities in any way.

Recognizing the force in the Indian plea for more self-government, the Parliament of Great Britain passed a number of acts designed to permit the Indian people to take part in making and enforcing laws in their country (§ 701). In 1919 it declared its intention of providing for “the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the British Empire.” Two years later, under the auspices of the British governor-general, an Indian legislature consisting of two houses, partly appointed and partly elected, was duly opened. Its lawmaking powers were strictly limited, however, and the British government retained the express right to override its resolutions and orders. This concession did not satisfy the extremists in India, and the agitation for still more power, if not complete independence, was continued with varying degrees of excitement. The spread of education, industries, and democratic ideas kept the land in ferment and made the problems of government by military force increasingly difficult.

**1101. Break-down of the Chinese Republic.** The disorders which started in China soon after the overthrow of the emperor in 1912 (§ 816) continued during the World War and afterwards. The republican government—with a president and a parliament—established at the time of the revolution in 1912 never succeeded in attaining complete authority over the country. On the contrary, in various places there rose numerous war lords with great armies, as in feudal Europe after the break-up of the Roman Empire, and the provinces of China became almost independent of the central administration. In the dissolution, three cities—Peking, the old capital, Mukden in the north, and Canton in the south—became the chief centers of military leaders. From these cities armies went out from time to time seeking to conquer the rest of the country. At the opening of 1927 it looked as if the Canton army might come out victorious, for it had swept up to the rich valley of the Yangtze

River, had taken the city of Hankow on the north bank, and had occupied the Chinese section of Shanghai, the great center of foreign trade near the mouth of the river.

In this state of affairs the government at Peking, which was supposed to speak for the nation, consisted merely of a president and a cabinet set up by the war lord temporarily in authority at the capital. It had little power within the walls of the city and less power outside, although it was officially recognized by the foreign nations, including the United States. Being short of money, it was lacking in almost everything else. Its chief source of revenue, the customs duties, was controlled by a foreign agency which collected the money, paid first the interest on certain of China's foreign debts, and then turned the balance over to the Peking treasury.

For a time, especially while England and the United States were busy with the World War, Japan tried to extend her authority in dissolving China. With the nominal aid of Great Britain she wrested Shantung from Germany in 1914 and took over the government of that province. The following year Japan made "twenty-one demands" on China and forced the Peking government to consent to most of them. By this act Japan seemed on the point of becoming predominant on the neighboring mainland. But when Great Britain got through with the war in Europe, and the United States again became actively interested in Far Eastern affairs in 1921, the ambitious Japanese found themselves checkmated. At the Washington Conference (§ 1096) the principle of equal rights for foreigners in China was proclaimed anew, and Japan shortly afterwards withdrew her troops from Shantung.

Still the unity of China was not restored. Fighting among the war lords continued and, to add to the confusion, there sprang up another great anti-foreign movement akin to the Boxer unrest at the opening of the century (§ 809). In spirit this was a Nationalist movement also and had its strength among the masses of the people. Thus, while their own government was falling down about their ears, patriotic Chinese united in declaring "the foreigners must go." They called for the abolition of the foreign courts, in which

foreign judges tried their own people for offenses committed in China and heard their own lawsuits even when Chinese were involved. They demanded that China should have the right to fix her own customs taxes, now regulated by foreign powers under treaties. They insisted upon a return of the territory held by Great Britain, Japan, and other countries and asked for a cancellation of all special rights enjoyed by foreigners in "the treaty ports." Thus, fifteen years after the proclamation of the republic, the fate of China was uncertain. While the foreign powers that interfered continually in Chinese affairs professed to desire the establishment of a strong government in Peking, they were jealous of one another, and they all knew very well that if China did get a strong government at the national capital a great many foreigners would be expelled bag and baggage. So the policy of "muddling along" was generally followed.

**1102. Rapid Modernization of Japan.** While her ancient neighbor, China, was in continual trouble, Japan, under her emperor and a powerful ruling class of landlords and capitalists, kept order at home and extended her commerce abroad. During the momentous years when the Western industrial nations were engrossed in the World War, Japan's factories, mills, and mines multiplied, and her great cities, such as Osaka, Tokyo, and Yokohama, spread out under smoky skies like Manchester in England or Essen in Germany. In the midst of the old-fashioned low Japanese houses and offices, tall modern buildings, six or eight stories high, arose in profusion. As a system of universal education was successfully operated, newspapers increased their circulation until the greatest dailies could boast of a million readers. With industries came trade unions and a labor movement; with a labor movement came democratic and socialistic agitations; and in 1925 the Japanese parliament, stirred by popular demands, adopted a universal manhood-suffrage law increasing the number of voters from three to fourteen million. Though the terrible earthquake and conflagration which shattered Tokyo and Yokohama in 1923 checked Japan's prosperity, the people set to work with great zeal to restore their ruined cities, and within four years were almost back to a normal basis.



With China prostrate, Japan naturally became the dominant power in the Orient, and all countries watch her policies and activities with the greatest interest. Will she continue to coöperate cordially with Great Britain and the United States in deciding Oriental questions, or will she swing over to Russia and China and seek to establish a Pan-Asiatic combination? That has long been a vital question for the Western powers. During the World War Japan threw in her lot with the *Entente* Allies, though a strong party of Japanese wanted to join Germany and crush both Russia and the British Empire. After the war she joined the Western countries represented at the Washington Conference and showed a willingness to work with them in trying to evolve a peaceful policy for the Pacific Ocean.

But after the United States passed the immigration act of 1924, expressly excluding Japanese immigrants from the country, there was launched in Japan a strong movement in favor of a Pan-Asiatic policy. Those who supported this idea declared that Japan had got small thanks for her efforts to please England and the United States and urged their government to unite with their near neighbors in Asia with a view to breaking the supremacy of the two Anglo-Saxon powers in Asiatic affairs. Though this movement has not yet grown to serious proportions, it is clear that the peace of Europe—indeed, of the world—in the coming years may very well hang upon decisions made in Tokyo. In short, those who are seeking to establish and to preserve peace among the nations must recognize that the Orient is also one of the military danger-spots of the world, presenting problems that call for special study, sympathetic understanding, and the spirit of fair play.

## EPILOGUE

**1103. What of the Future?** Every reader of this book will soon be a voter and will have to express opinions on the great questions that perplex our age. Even though the United States is far away from Europe as measured by miles, it is very close as measured by cables, wireless telegraph, and wireless telephones. Moreover, as

we have seen, it is in fact entangled in many ways in the affairs of the Old World: by commerce, by investments, and by all kinds of relations involving danger of war. By no conceivable line of reasoning can we conclude that the United States would not become entangled if another great quarrel like that of 1914 should arise. Furthermore, the problems of capital and labor, of imperialism and pacifism, of socialism and social reform, long debated in Europe, are being discussed in the United States. They appear on every hand: in times of strikes, when we hear a great deal about Bolshevist influences, and in our relations with Mexico, Nicaragua, and other Latin-American countries. It would be a great mistake, therefore, for American citizens to turn their backs on Europe, Asia, and South America and refuse to take any interest in world affairs.

**1104. The Conservatives.** If we study the present-day currents in Europe closely we see three rather distinct movements: conservatism, Bolshevism, and reform. In general, conservatives are comfortable people who own property and believe that radical changes are dangerous for everybody. If they are ultra-conservative, they may think that occasional wars are desirable or at least necessary; that permanent peace is a delusion and a dream; that each country must "expand," that is, seek continually to gain more trade and territory in competition with other nations; that their government should use the army and navy to protect citizens everywhere in the world, no matter what they are doing; that large armies and navies are necessary; and that anybody who opposes such ideas is a "dangerous radical." Of course most conservatives believe in progress and reform; but they think that changes should come about gradually, and they have no great hopes for any astounding improvements over the past. On the whole they suspect that the future, like the past, will be full of wars, poverty, and disease, and that not very much can be done about it.

**1105. The Bolsheviks.** Opposed to the conservatives are the Bolsheviks, who are convinced that the world could be made over suddenly by a violent revolution upsetting the present business system. They maintain that wars grow out of the efforts of business men to get more trade and earn larger profits in other countries,

especially in backward places, such as Africa. They ascribe the existence of poverty to modern business methods, which they call "capitalism," and declare that poverty cannot be abolished while farms, railways, factories, and other enterprises are owned by individuals and run for profit. They allege that the interests of the laboring people are directly opposed to those of business men and call on the former to join a revolutionary party to seize the government and private property in land, machinery, and other means of production. When that is accomplished, they claim, all the nations of the earth can be federated in peace. In a word, they profess to believe that world order and prosperity can be attained by violence.

**1106. The Patient Improvers.** Between these extremes are all sorts of politicians, writers, teachers, and speakers, who believe that great reforms can be achieved by the spread of education and by common effort. In the main they hold that wars are disastrous follies which bring damage to victors as well as to vanquished and can be avoided if the peoples of the earth will employ a little more intelligence in their affairs. Through the League of Nations, the World Court, and conventions like the Washington Conference and the Locarno Conference, they hope to bring about a peaceful settlement of all disputes arising among nations. In internal affairs they expect to abolish undeserved poverty and low standards of life by many different measures, such as old-age pensions and government housing schemes, not by sudden and violent attacks on business men. Though they differ among themselves as to methods, their spirit is thoughtfully expressed by H. G. Wells, that modern reformer who has, in writing history and novels, steadily urged upon mankind the pursuit of peace and the good life. In bringing to a close his *Outline of History*, he says:

"We know enough to-day to know that there is infinite room for betterment in every human concern. Nothing is needed but collective effort. Our poverty, our restraints, our infections and indigestions, our quarrels and misunderstandings, are all things controllable and removable by concerted human action; but we know as little how life would feel without them as some poor, dirty,

ill-treated, fierce-souled creature, born and bred amidst the cruel and dingy surroundings of a European back street, can know what it is to bathe every day, always be beautifully clad, to climb mountains for pleasure, to fly, to meet none but agreeable, well-mannered people, to conduct researches or make delightful things. Yet a time when all such good things will be for all men may be coming more nearly than we think. Each one who believes that brings the time nearer; each heart that fails delays it."<sup>1</sup>

It is not the business of the historian to take sides in these controversies, but to explain how they happened to arise. Neither is it given to any of us to foresee the future with the eye of a prophet. One thing is certain, however: by studying the writings and watching the operations of these three parties in modern Europe we can best understand what is happening there, and in that way acquire more intelligence for dealing with our own problems as citizens of the United States. Ignorance and indifference are our greatest enemies.

### QUESTIONS

I. Describe the controversy over German "reparations." How did it happen that the "Dawes plan" was drawn up? Give some of the features of that plan.

II. Enumerate some of the European grievances likely to lead to new wars. What was the Locarno Conference? State the chief provisions of the Locarno Pact. What were the Locarno arbitration treaties? Why may we say that the Locarno treaties represent a new era in international relations?

III. How has the League of Nations promoted peace? Describe the Permanent Court of International Justice. How does it differ from the Hague Court of Arbitration? Describe some of the attempts to reduce armaments? What was the American plan? Has anything come of these projects?

IV. What grounds do the Germans have for being discontented with the territorial settlement at Versailles? Why is Germany reviving the question of colonies? Explain what is meant by "the war-guilt issue." What is the judgment of neutral historians now? Why does Mussolini

<sup>1</sup> From H. G. Wells's *Outline of History*. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers.



talk about "Italy's place in the sun"? Describe the peculiar position of Russia among the great powers of the world.

V. Give the purpose and results of the Washington Conference. How did "the European debt question" arise? Give some of the steps taken to settle it. In what way are American investors becoming involved in European governments and industries? What has been the attitude of the United States toward the World Court?

VI. Account for the disturbances in India. Explain "nonresistance." What home-rule rights have been granted to India by Great Britain? Show how the Chinese republic has broken down since the revolution. Explain the rise of nationalism in China. What do the Nationalists demand? In what ways has Japan been modernized? How has Japan coöperated with the Western powers? Why are the policies of Japan important for England and the United States?

#### REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL READING

For the study of international relations since the World War the following pamphlets on international conciliation published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 405 West 117th Street, New York City, at five cents each, are of great value: *The Dawes Report on German Reparation Payments* (November, 1924); *The Problem of Minorities* (September, 1926); *Final Protocol of the Locarno Conference* (January, 1926); *The United States and the System of Mandates* (October, 1925); *The Political Doctrine of Fascism* (October, 1926); *Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan* (June, 1925); *The Fourth Year of the Permanent Court of International Justice* (April, 1926); *European Security* (September, 1925).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOK I

France under Louis XIV. ADAMS, *The Growth of the French Nation*, chaps. xii-xiii. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V, chaps. i-ii, xiii-xiv. DURUY, *History of France*, Thirteenth Period. WAKEMAN, *The Ascendancy of France, 1598-1715*. HASSALL, *Louis XIV and the Zenith of the French Monarchy* (Heroes of the Nations Series). PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, and *France under Louis XV*.

Central and Eastern Europe. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V, chaps. xvi, xx-xxi; Vol. VI. RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vols. I-II. BRIGHT, *Maria Theresa*. CARLYLE, *History of Frederick the Second, called Frederick the Great*, a classic. EVERSLEY, *The Partitions of Poland*. HASSALL, *The Balance of Power, 1715-1789*, full account of diplomacy and wars. KLUCHEVSKY, *A History of Russia* (3 vols.). PHILLIPS, *Poland* (Home University Series). SCHEVILL, *The Making of Modern Germany*, Lectures I-II. SCHUYLER, *Peter the Great*, standard English biography. WALISZEWSKI, *Life of Peter the Great*.

Imperial Rivalry of England and France. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V, chap. xxii; Vol. VI, chaps. vi, xv. CROSS, *A History of England and Greater Britain*, chap. xli. EGERTON, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy*. GIBBONS, *British Commerce and Colonies from Elizabeth to Victoria*. ROBINSON J. HOWARD, *The Development of the British Empire*. LYALL, *The Rise of British Dominion in India*. WOODWARD, *A Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire*. CHEYNEY, *The European Background of American History*, an excellent survey. EDGAR, *The Struggle for a Continent*. HUNTER, *A Brief History of the Indian Peoples*. LUCAS, *A Historical Geography of the British Colonies* (5 vols.). MACAULAY, *Essay on Clive*. MAHAN, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783*. MORRIS, *A History of Colonization* (2 vols.). PARKMAN, *A Half-Century of Conflict* (2 vols.). SEELEY, *The Expansion of England*. THWAITES, *The Colonies*. TRAILL, *Social England*, Vol. V.

## BOOK II

The Old Order in Europe. ASHTON, *Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne*. GIBBINS, *Industry in England*, chaps. xvii-xx. HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, chaps. iii-vii. LOWELL, *The Eve of the French Revolu-*

tion. PROTHERO, *English Farming, Past and Present*, chaps. v-xi, excellent. SYDNEY, *England and the English in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols.), *Translations and Reprints of the University of Pennsylvania*, Vol. V, No. 2; Vol. VI, No. 1. YOUNG, *Travels in France, 1787-1789*, a first-hand source of great importance. CUNNINGHAM, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Modern Times*, Pt. I. DE TOCQUEVILLE, *The State of Society in France before the Revolution*, a careful analysis of conditions. LECKY, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (8 vols.). OVERTON, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. TAINÉ, *The Ancient Régime*.

**The Spirit of Reform.** BURY, *A History of Freedom of Thought* (Home University Series), chap. vi, admirable. *A History of the Idea of Progress* by the same. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V, chap. xxiii. MARVIN, *Science and Civilization*. MCGIFFERT, *Protestant Thought before Kant*, chap. x. MONTESQUIEU, *The Spirit of Laws* (Nugent's translation). ROUSSEAU, *Discourses* and *Émile* and *The Social Contract* (Everyman's Library). SMITH, *The Wealth of Nations*. STEPHENS, *The Life and Writings of Turgot*. CARLYLE, *History of Frederick the Second, called Frederick the Great*. GIDE and RIST, *A History of Economic Doctrines* (translated by Richards). LECKY, *A History of the Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe* (2 vols.). MORLEY, *Critical Miscellanies; Rousseau; Voltaire*, interesting essays. ROBERTSON, *A Short History of Free Thought, Ancient and Modern* (2 vols.). ANTHONY, KATHARINE, *Catherine the Great*.

### BOOK III

**The Old Régime in France.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chaps. ii-iv. DE TOCQUEVILLE, *The State of Society in France before the Revolution of 1789*. LOWELL, *The Eve of the French Revolution*. TAINÉ, *The Ancient Régime*.

**The French Revolution.** ROBINSON, *The New History*, chap. vii. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, especially chaps. i-iii. MATTHEWS, *The French Revolution*, Pt. III. ROSE, *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era*, chaps. i-iii. STEPHENS, *A History of the French Revolution* (2 vols.). AULARD, *The French Revolution: A Political History, 1789-1804* (4 vols.), a good political history. BOURNE, *The Revolutionary Period in Europe*, chaps. vii-x, a recent manual. CARLYLE, *The French Revolution*, a literary masterpiece but written from insufficient materials. TAINÉ, *The French Revolution* (3 vols.), Vol. I; Vol. II, chaps. i-iv, brilliant but unsympathetic. MADELIN, LOUIS, *The French Revolution*. Best recent treatment.

*Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, especially chap. xii. MATTHEWS, *The French Revolution*, Pt. IV. ANDERSON, *Constitutions and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France, 1789-1907*, a valuable collection for modern French history. BURKE, *Reflections on the French Revolution* (Everyman's Library), a bitter criticism of the whole movement. MORRIS,

*Diary and Letters* (2 vols.), contains some vivid description by an American observer. PAINE, *The Rights of Man*, an answer to Burke.

**Napoleon and Europe.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. VIII, chaps. xviii-xxv; Vol. IX, chaps. i-iii. FISHER, *Napoleon* (Home University Series), chaps. i-v. FOURNIER, *Napoleon the First*, chaps. i-vii, excellent. JOHNSTON, *Napoleon*, chaps. i-vi, the best brief account in English. ROSE, *The Life of Napoleon the First*, Vol. I, chaps. i-xi, the most scholarly account in English. ANDERSON, *Constitutions and Other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France, 1789-1907*. DE RÉMUSAT, *Memoirs of Madame de Rémusat*. MIOT DE MELITO, *Memoirs of Miot de Melito*. BIGELOW, *A History of the German Struggle for Liberty*. SEELEY, *The Life and Times of Stein*, a study of Prussia under Stein. SLOANE, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte*, Vols. III-IV. TAINE, *The Modern Régime* (2 vols.), keen analysis of Napoleon.

## BOOK IV

**Europe after the Congress of Vienna.** There are several works on the political history of Europe after the settlement at Vienna in addition to those of HAYES and SCHAPIRO referred to at the end of the chapters: ANDREWS, *The Historical Development of Modern Europe* (2 vols.); FYFFE, *History of Modern Europe* (in a single volume and a three-volume edition); HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*; PHILLIPS, *Modern Europe, 1815-1899*; and SEIGNOBOS, *A Political History of Europe since 1814* (translation of a French work). For the plans of the Tsar, Alexander I, and the European congresses, see PHILLIPS, *The Confederation of Europe*. Special treatments: HUME, *Modern Spain*; STILLMAN, *The Union of Italy*; SYBEL, *The Founding of the German Empire*, Vol. I.

**The Industrial Revolution.** ALLSOPP, *An Introduction to English Industrial History*, Pt. IV, excellent book for young students. CHEYNEY, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*. GIBBINS, *Industry in England*, chaps. xx-xxi. MARVIN, *The Living Past*, chaps. ix-x. POLLARD, *The History of England* (Home University Series), chap. vii. SLATER, *The Making of Modern England* (American edition), especially the introduction, excellent. BYRN, *The Progress of Invention in the Nineteenth Century*. COCHRANE, *Modern Industrial Progress*. CUNNINGHAM, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce: Modern Times*, Pt. II. HOBSON, *The Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, excellent. KIRKUP, *A History of Socialism*, well written and fair.

**Revolutionary Europe—Italian and German Unity.** In addition to the general histories cited above, there are the following special volumes: *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XI. BARRY, *The Papacy and Modern Times* (Home University Series). GARIBALDI, *Autobiography*. MAZZINI, *Duties of*



*Man* (Everyman's Library). CESARESCO, *Cavour and the Liberation of Italy*. KING, *A History of Italian Unity* (2 vols.). STILLMAN, *The Union of Italy*. BISMARCK, *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman*, an autobiography. BUSCH, *Bismarck, Some Secret Pages of his History*. HEADLAM, *Bismarck and the Foundation of the German Empire*. SCHEVILL, *The Making of Modern Germany*, Lectures I-V, very enthusiastic. SMITH, *Bismarck and German Unity*.

## BOOK V

**Germany.** BARKER, *Modern Germany*. *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, chap. vi. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chap. xiv. HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany* (1916 edition), chaps. xi-xiii. HOWE, *Socialized Germany*. KRUGER, *Government and Politics of the German Empire*, excellent. OGG, *The Governments of Europe*, chaps. ix-xiv. DODD, *Modern Constitutions*. DAWSON, *The Evolution of Modern Germany*. DEWEY, *German Philosophy and Politics*. GOOCH, G. P., *Germany*. HOWARD, *The German Empire*, chaps. i-xiii. TOWER, *Germany To-day* (Home University Series).

**France.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, chap. v. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chap. xv. BRACQ, *France under the Republic*, Pt. II, chaps. xlvi-xlix. OGG, *The Governments of Europe*, Pt. III, best brief analysis. BRACQ, *France under the Republic*. COUBERTIN, *The Evolution of France under the Third Republic*. HANOTAUX, *Contemporary France* (3 vols.). LOWELL, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe* (2 vols.). VIZETELLY, *Republican France*. The constitution of France is to be found in DODD, *Modern Constitutions*.

**Great Britain.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XI, chaps. i, xii; Vol. XII, chaps. iii-iv. CHEYNEY, *A Short History of England*, chaps. xix-xx. CROSS, *A History of England and Greater Britain*, chaps. 1-iv. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chaps. xviii-xxi, excellent. OGG, *The Governments of Europe*, chaps. i-viii. OMAN, *England in the Nineteenth Century*. SLATER, *The Making of Modern England* (American edition), with select bibliography.

BAGEHOT, *The English Constitution*. HUTCHINS and HARRISON, *A History of Factory Legislation*. LOWELL, *The Government of England* (2 vols.), a standard work. MEDLEY, *English Constitutional History*, a good reference manual. PAUL, *A History of Modern England* (5 vols.), liberal in politics. SMITH, *Irish History and the Irish Question*. WEBB, *Problems of Modern Industry*. Three good biographies are: MONYPENNY and BUCKLE, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli*; MORLEY, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*; TREVELYAN, *The Life of John Bright*. HAYES, *British Social Politics*, a collection of speeches by English statesmen on social reform. KENDALL, *A Source Book of English History*. LEE, *Source Book of English History*, Pt. VIII, chaps. xxx-xxxiii.

## BOOK VI

**The British Empire.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XI, chap. xxvii; Vol. XII, chap. xx. ROBINSON, J. HOWARD, *The Development of the British Empire*. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chap. xxii. OMAN, *England in the Nineteenth Century*, chaps. ix-xii. STORY, *The British Empire*. BURINOT, *Canada under British Rule*. DILKE, *Problems of Greater Britain*. EGERTON, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy*. FRASER, *British Rule in India*. HOBSON, *The War in South Africa*. INNES, *A History of England and the British Empire*, Vol. IV. JENKS, *A History of the Australasian Colonies*. LOWELL, *The Government of England*, Vol. II, chaps. liv-lviii. MCCARTHY, *A History of Our Own Times* (7 vols.), Vols. V-VII. PAUL, *A History of Modern England*, Vols. II, IV.

**The Russian Empire.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. X, chap. xiii; Vol. XI, chap. xxi; Vol. XII, chap. xiii. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chaps. xxix-xxx. SKRINE, *The Expansion of Russia*, best brief survey. KENNAN, *Siberia and the Exile System* (2 vols.). KROPOTKIN, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*. ALEXINSKY, *Modern Russia*. KRAUSSE, *Russia in Asia*. MAVOR, *An Economic History of Russia* (2 vols.), elaborate and excellent. MILYOUKOV, *Russia and its Crisis*, a valuable work by a leader in Russian thought and politics. RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, Vol. III; *Expansion of Russia*. WALLACE, *Russia* (2 vols.), readable and thorough survey. OLGIN, *The Soul of the Russian Revolution*.

**Turkey and the Near-Eastern Question.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, chap. xiv. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chap. xxviii. SEIGNOBOS, *A Political History of Europe since 1814*, chaps. xx-xxi. GIBBONS, *The New Map of Europe*, very readable. MARRIOTT, J. A. R., *The Eastern Question*. ABBOTT, *Turkey in Transition*. BUXTON, *Turkey in Revolution*. DAVEY, *The Sultan and his Subjects* (2 vols.). LANE-POOLE, *The Story of Turkey*. MILLER, *The Ottoman Empire and The Balkans*. ROSE, *The Development of the European Nations* (2 vols.), Vol. I. BUCHAN, JOHN (Editor) (The Nations of Today Series), *The Baltic and Caucasian States and Bulgaria and Rumania*.

**The Expansion of Europe.** *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, chaps. xv-xxii. DOUGLAS, *Europe and the Far East*, excellent. HAZEN, *Europe since 1815*, chaps. xxiii, xxx. HOLDERNESS, *Peoples and Problems of India* (Home University Series). JOHNSTON, *The Opening up of Africa* (Home University Series). REINSCH, *World Politics*. ROSE, *The Development of the European Nations*. DENNIS, *Christian Missions and Social Progress*. GILES, *The Civilization of China* (Home University Series); *China and the Chinese*. HUNTER, *The Indian Empire*. KNOX, *Japanese Life in Town and Country*. HARRIS, *Intervention and Colonization in Africa*, a recent, reliable guide. KELTIE, *The Partition of Africa*. WEALE, *The Reshaping of the Far East* (2 vols.).

## BOOK VII

**Diplomatic Negotiations Preceding the World War.** The action of the Russian, German, and Austrian revolutionists in publishing the secret treaties and papers, found in their respective foreign offices, has changed very radically all previous views on the origins of the World War. The policies and relations of Serbia, Russia, England, and France, in particular, are put in an entirely new light. Certainly the theories generally held in the United States before 1917 have been completely upset by these "revelations." However the whole problem of "war origins" is so mixed up with the question of German "war guilt" that it is very difficult to get at the truth of the matter. From the English standpoint, but very soberly and carefully, the issues have been stated in G. P. GOOCH, *Franco-German Relations, 1878-1914*, and still more broadly in his *History of Modern Europe, 1878-1919*. In a temperate and scholarly work, a calm German judgment has been rendered by M. MONTGELAS in his *Case for the Central Powers*—an English edition of the German book which bears the better title of *The Leading Threads in the Problem of War Guilt*. From France has come another reasoned study of war origin: A. FABRE-LUCE, *The Limitations of Victory*. A general survey of the materials is to be found in H. E. BARNES, *The Genesis of the World War*, but though useful it must be used carefully because the author, reacting violently against the former indiscriminate abuse of Germany, is inclined to let the German government off too easily.

**Points of View on the War.** ROSE, *The Origins of the War*, from an English standpoint. VON MACH, *Germany's Point of View*, an attempt to justify Germany's policy in America's eyes. DAVIS, *The Roots of the War*, from an ardent American point of view.

For German ideas of government and war, see JOHN DEWEY, *German Philosophy and Politics, 1915*, a survey of thought in the last century; *Out of their Own Mouths, 1917*; *Gems (?) of German Thought*, edited by WILLIAM ARCHER; BANG, *Hurrah and Hallelujah*; BERNHARDI, *Germany and the Next War*, a plea for war as a civilizing force.

**Works on the Settlement at Paris.** There is now a huge mass of literature on this subject. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has published *The Treaties of Peace*. An English work in six volumes, H. W. V. TEMPERLEY, *The History of the Peace Conference at Paris*, covers the events in great detail. President Wilson's part is described in R. S. BAKER, *Woodrow Wilson and the World Settlement (3 vols.)*. For the causes, the strategy, and results of the war *These Eventful Years (2 vols.)* by the Encyclopædia Britannica Company, published in 1924, is invaluable, especially as it contains articles by authorities in various countries.

**Europe Since the World War.** A brief general survey to 1922, C. A. BEARD, *Cross Currents in Europe To-day. These Eventful Years*, cited above.

also deals with the course of affairs to 1924. On the League of Nations, the publications of the World Peace Foundation, 40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass., issued at a low cost, are invaluable, especially for documents and source materials. PARKER T. MOON, *Syllabus on International Relations* (1925), is an excellent guide to events and gives a useful list of books and articles. *Imperialism and World Politics*, by the same author (1926), deals with European economic expansion and recent international rivalries. For the new plans of government, see MCBAIN and ROGERS, *The New Constitutions of Europe*.

**Current History.** The *Historical Outlook* (formerly *History Teachers' Magazine*) (Philadelphia) publishes excellent bibliographies. *Current History*, published monthly by the New York Times Company, gives many important documents and admirable maps, portraits, and pictures of war episodes. *The Statesman's Yearbook* gives an annual picture of the world's affairs.

*The American Yearbook* which renewed publication in 1925 has a section in international relations affecting the United States. *The Political Science Quarterly*, published at Columbia University, issues annually, in March, a *Record of Political Events* for the previous calendar year, in moderate compass, which furnishes, perhaps, the easiest and best guide for American high-school students. With *Current History* and this *Record* at hand, the path into the more elaborate and difficult works can be readily opened.





## INDEX

*Marked letters sound as in* åsk, fär, hër, thêre, möve, ôrb, füll; *French* boñ, menü;  
*κ like German ch in* ich, ach

- Absentee landlordism in Ireland, 368 f.,  
 370  
 Absolute monarchy, different attitude  
 of French and English toward, 6  
 Ab'ys sin'i a, 283  
 Academy, French, 9  
 Acre (ä'kêr), 158  
 Act of Union, Ireland, 371  
 Adams, Samuel, 46  
 Aërial warfare, 558  
 Af'ri ca, 38, 44, 199, 283; German  
 East and German Southwest, 318 f.;  
 French in North and West, 340 f.;  
 British and Dutch in South, 397 ff.;  
 exploration and partition of, 455 ff.  
 Agadir (äg á dër'), 531  
 Agra (ä'grä), 41  
 Aix-la-Chapelle (äks-lä-shä pël'), 204  
 Alaska, 200  
 Albert, king of Belgium, 217 n., 546  
 Alexander the Great, 153, 157, 178 n.  
 Alexander I (Tsar), 172, 174, 183, 203,  
 406  
 Alexander II of Russia, 410, 414  
 Alexander III of Russia, 415  
 Alexandria (al eg zan' dri a), 157 f.  
 Al fon'so XII, XIII, 297 n.  
 Alfred the Great, 88  
 Algeciras (al he the'räs), conference,  
 461  
 Algeria (al jër'i a), 339  
 Alsace (äl sä's'), 11, 102, 299, 326, 591  
 Amadeus (am a dë'us), 297  
 America, 37, 44, 49; United States, 2;  
 English colonies in, 2, 15, 39 f., 44,  
 49, 199; expulsion of French from,  
 15, 43; South, 38, 223; North, 39,  
 286; New England, 39; Spanish  
 colonies in, 49, 223 f.; Central, 223;  
 United States and France, 254 n.  
*See* World War  
 American plan, 638  
 American Revolution, 48, 223  
 Amiens (äm'ï enz, *Fr.* ä mē an'), 580,  
 583; Peace of, 168  
 Am'ster dam, 38, 56  
 Anæsthetics, 504  
 A nam', 341  
 Ang'li can Church, 65  
 Angra Pequena (äng'grä pä kã'nä),  
 319  
 Anne, Queen, 93; Tsarina, 90 n.  
 Antiseptics, 504 f.  
 Antitoxins, 505  
 Ant'werp, 56, 216, 547  
 Arbitration treaties, 524 f., 634 f.  
*Areopagitica*, by Milton, 76  
 Argentina (är jen tē'na), 286  
 Ar gonne' Forest, 583  
 Aristotle (ar'is totl), 70, 84, 178 n.  
 Arkwright, Richard, 232  
 Armies and navies of Europe in 1914,  
 518 ff.  
 Armistice terms, 587  
 Army. *See* Militarism  
 Arras (är räs'), 566, 581  
 Articles of Confederation, 49  
 Artois (ar twä'), count of, 134, 210 f.  
 Ashley, Lord, 363  
 Asia, 38, 44  
 As'quith, prime minister, 476  
*Assignats* (ä sē nyä'), 131 f.  
 Associations Law, 335  
 Atomic theory, 506 f.  
 Atrocities, 140, 146 f., 283, 421, 426,  
 433, 441, 460  
 Augsburg (ôgz'bërg, *G.* ougs'börk), 164  
 Aurungzeb (ô rung zeb'), 40, 384  
 Austerlitz (ous'ter lits), 170, 172, 256  
 Australia, 200, 394 ff.  
 Austria, 33 ff., 42, 51, 91; and France,  
 113, 138, 142, 145 f., 153 f., 161 ff.,  
 169, 180, 182, 187; and other Great  
 Powers, 169, 204; emperor of, 171,  
 203, 218, 262, 270; since 1866, re-  
 lations with Serbia, 429, 538; ulti-

- matum of, to Serbia, 540; in World War, 543; collapse, 585; after World War, 623 f. *See* Germany, Italy, Prussia, etc.
- Austria-Hungary, 301, 532, 536, 537, 538, 539, 543; dissolution of, 592
- Austrian Succession, War of, 42
- Autocracy, German, 579
- Bä'ber, 40
- Babœuf (bä bœf'), 249
- Bacon, Francis, 72, 74, 93
- Bacon, Roger, 71 f.
- Bä'den, 164, 167, 195, 221, 267, 295, 299
- Bagdad Railroad, 539
- Bä lä klä'vä, 431
- "Balance of power," 95
- Baldwin, Stanley, 619
- Balkans, 18; wars in the, 415, 433 f., 532 f., 535 ff.; in the World War, 555; after the World War, 625 ff.
- Bal'tic Sea, 21, 182
- Baltic States, new, 592 f., 602
- Baltimore, Lord, 66 n.
- Bamberg (bam'berg), 164
- Bap'tists, 66
- Basel (bä'z'l), 164; Treaty of (1795), 153
- Bastille (bäs täl'), the, 125 f., 165
- "Battle of the Nations," 187
- Ba vä'r'i a, 94, 164, 167, 195, 209, 221, 267, 295; duke of, 26; king of, 170
- Bayonne (bä yon'), 179
- Beccaria (bek kä rē'ä), 82 f.
- Bel'gians, 91, 194
- Bel'gium, 167, 215, 307, 541, 547 f.
- Bengal (ben göl'), 40, 43, 200
- Beresford (ber'es ferd), General, 224
- Berlin, 55, 267; University of, 186, 208; Congress of (1878), 434, 533; Congress of (1884), 459; decree, 174
- Bernadotte (ber nä dö't'), General, 196 f.
- Bernstorff, Count von, 563
- Bible, 264
- Birmingham, 37, 345
- Bishops, 164
- Bismarck (biz'märk), Otto von, 290 f., 296, 312 ff.
- Blackstone, 82
- Blanc, Louis (blän), 250, 252
- Blockades, 175, 553
- Blücher (blük'er), General, 190
- Boers (börz), 398; war with England, 400 f.; World War, 401 f.
- Bö hē'mi a, 171, 261, 269, 301
- Bohemians, 91
- Bolivar (bö lē'vär), 224
- Bolsheviki (böl she vē kē'), 17, 568 f., 612 f., 651 f.
- Bom bāy', 41
- Bonaparte (bō'nä pärt), Napoleon, 152 ff.; and the Directory, 155 f., 158; and England, 157
- Bonaparte, Jerome, 173, 188
- Bonaparte, Joseph, 171, 179
- Bonaparte, Louis, 171
- Bonaparte, Lucien, 160
- Bonapartists, 325, 329
- Bordeaux (bor dö'), 143, 236, 325; duke of, 214
- Borodino (bö rö dyē nō'), 183
- Bosnia (böz'ni ä) and Herzegovina (hēr'tsé go vē'nä), 534, 540
- Boston Tea Party, 47
- Botha (bö'tä), General, 401
- Boulogne (bö lön'), 169 f.
- Bourbons (bör'büns), 194, 210, 214, 222, 228, 248, 284 n., 297, 328. *See* Louis
- Boxer insurrection, 449
- Boyne River, 368
- Braddock, General, 42
- Brandenburg (brän'den bērg), 122
- Brä zil', 227, 286, 566
- Bremen (brä'men), 164, 182, 295
- Brest-Litovsk (brest'-lyē töfsk'), Treaty of, 571
- Bright, John, 364, 366
- British Commonwealth of Nations, 621 ff.
- British Empire, relative area, 38
- Brit'ta ny, 103, 145
- Brown, John, 304
- Bruges (brö'jēz or brüzh), 216
- Brumaire (brü mēr'), of the 18th, 159
- Brunswick, duke of, 139, 172
- Brus'sels, 190, 216, 546
- Bucharest (bö ka rest'), Treaty of, 537; in World War, 558
- Buenos Aires (bwä'nös ī res), 224, 227
- Buffon, 502
- Bukowina (bö kō vē'nä), 302, 573
- Bulgaria, 433 f., 555, 584, 595, 626
- Bundesrat (bün'des rät), 295, 310
- Bunker Hill, 47

- Burgoyne (bér goin'), General, 48  
 Burke, Edmund, 47  
 Bur'ma, 386  
 Burns, Robert, 206
- Cabinet, English, 96, 354 ff.  
 Cable, submarine, 380  
 Cabot (kab'ut), 286  
 Că'diz, 225  
*Cahiers* (kā yă'), 121  
 Cairo (kī'rō), 157  
 Calais (kal'is, *Fr.* kā lā'), 548  
 Calcutta, 40, 43  
 Calendar, 140 n., 148 n., 150, 158, 165  
 Caliphate, abolished, 627  
 Calonne (kā lon'), 116, 118  
 Calvinists, 92  
 Cam bō'di a, 341  
 Cameroons (kām ér rōonz'), 318, 552  
 Campo-Formio, Treaty of, 154  
 Canada, 37, 39, 42 f., 46, 49, 200, 390 ff.  
 Canning, Secretary, 227  
 Cape of Good Hope, 199 f.  
 Carbonari (kār bō nā'rē), 225, 274  
 Carinthia, 301  
 Carlsbad (kärlls'bät), 220  
 Cär ni ö'la, 301  
 Carnot (kär nō'), 145  
 Cär'thage, 283  
 Casement, Sir R., 484  
 Catherine II, 30, 88, 113  
 Catholic Church, Roman. *See* Church  
 Catholic Emancipation Act, 370  
 Catholics, in Prussia, 88; in the Netherlands, 216; in Switzerland, 261 n.; in France, 279; in Italy, 284; in Austria, 302; in Germany, 313; in England, 360; in Ireland, 367; in America, 381  
 Cavaignac (kā ven yāk'), General, 254 f.  
 Cavendish, 372  
 Cavour (kā vör'), Count, 275, 279  
 Cell theory, 502 f.  
 Censorship, 64, 68, 74  
 Central America, 223  
 Ceylon (sē lon'), 199  
 Chambord (shän bōr'), count of, 328 f.  
 Chancellor, German, powers of, 311  
 Charlemagne (shär'le măn), 88, 167, 182  
 Charles I of England, 40, 66 n.  
 Charles II of England, 44  
 Charles X of France, 214  
 Charles V, Emperor, 33, 163, 297  
 Charles VI, Emperor, 126  
 Charles VII, Emperor, 26  
 Charles II of Spain, 11, 13  
 Charles XII of Sweden, 21  
 Charles XIV of Sweden, 196  
 Charles Albert of Sardinia, 266, 268, 275  
 Chartist movement, 349 ff.  
 Château Thierry (shä tō' tyêr rē'), 581, 582  
 Chemistry, 509 f.  
 Child labor, 329, 362  
 Chile (chē'lā), 224  
 China, 38, 386, 437 ff.; in World War, 566; breakdown of republic, 647 ff.  
 Chino-Japanese War, 445  
 Church, Roman Catholic, 62 ff.; Anglican, 65, 67, 93, 96 f., 369 f.; attacks upon, 77, 91; and state, 102; secularization, 130 f., 163; in France, 165, 211, 215, 332 f., 336 f.; in Italy, 281; in Austria, 302; in Ireland, 367; Greek, 410. *See* Clergy and Pope  
 Cisalpine (sīs ä'l'pīn) Republic, 154, 162, 164  
 Cities, revolt of, 145; imperial free, 164, 295  
 Civil war in France, 144, 150; in America, 296, 304  
 Classics, influence of, 205  
 Clemenceau (klā män sō'), 589  
 Clergy, 63, 65, 88, 92, 104 f., 120, 123, 150, 212, 262; Civil Constitution, 131; "nonjuring," 132, 134 f., 137 f., 165  
 Cleves (klēvz) and Berg, duke of, 171  
 Clive (kliv), Robert, 43  
 Cobden, Richard, 366  
 Cō'chin China, 339  
*Code Napoléon* (kōd nā pō lā òn'), 166  
 Colbert (kol bêt'), 9 f., 84  
 Cō lom'bi a, 224, 227, 377  
 Columbus, 286  
 Commerce, 37 ff., 71, 80, 92, 169, 176, 223, 240 f., 284, 288, 305; destruction of German, 553  
 Committee of Public Safety, 142, 145 ff.  
 Commons, House of, 346, 354 ff.  
 Com'mu nards, 327 f.  
 Com'mune, 126, 139 f., 144, 147, 149, 327



- Communism, 246 n., 603 f.; in Italy, 614; in Russia, 616  
 Compiègne (kōh'pyān'), 181  
 Con cor'dat of 1801, 165, 335  
 Congo, French, 339; Belgian, 459 f.  
 Connecticut, 49  
 Description, in England, 556 f.; in the United States, 565  
 Conservatism, 70; and reaction, 202 f., 210, 220 ff., 251, 268 ff., 290; in France, 492 f.; in Russia, 612; in Italy, 614 ff.; in Great Britain, 618 f.  
 Conservatives, 651  
 Constance (kon'stänts), 164  
 Constitution, United States, 49, 254 n., 305; French, 82, 116, 124, 128, 135, 149, 160, 167, 210 f., 254, 258; English, 97 f.; Swiss, 164, 196, 261; Holland, 167; Norwegian, 197; Swedish, 197; Dutch, 215; Belgian, 217; German, 219, 267 f., 307 f., 608 f.; Bavarian, 221; Spanish, 221, 225, 297 n.; Italian, 226, 275, 282; Prussian, 267 ff.; Austrian, 301; Hungarian, 301; Russian, 610 f.  
 Constitutional Convention, 140 ff., 149  
 Constitutions, New European, 605, 608, 610 f.  
 Consuls, 160, 167  
 Continental Congress, 47  
 Cō pēr'ni cus, 73, 74 n.  
 Corn laws, 366  
 Cornille (kor nāy'), 9  
 Cornwallis, General, 49  
 Cor'si ca, 103, 152  
 Cortes (kōr tās'), 221, 296  
 Cotton gin, 232  
 Council, of the Five Hundred, 149, 159; of the Elders, 149; of State, 166, 168  
 Council of Workingmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, 570  
 Coup d'état (kō dā tā'), 159, 256  
 Courland (kōr'land), 551  
 Crī mē'an War, 431 ff.  
 Crimes and Punishments, 83  
 Criminal colonies, 254, 328  
 Criminal laws reformed, 361  
 Croatia (krō ā'shi a), 301 f.; king of, 171  
 Crō'ats, 35, 262, 302 f.  
 Crompton, 235  
 Cromwell, Oliver, 44, 368  
 Cuba, 49, 565  
 Cul lō'den Moor, 95  
 Currency, paper in Europe, 601  
 Custozza (kös tōd'zä), 268, 280  
 Cyclopedia, Chambers's, 78  
 Czechoslovakia, 593, 602  
 Czechs (checks), 35, 204, 261, 266, 302, 593  
 Dail Eireann, 620  
 Dalmatia (dal mā'shi a), 302  
 Danton (dän tōn'), 144; execution of, 147  
 Dan'ube, 170, 262  
 Danzig, 592  
 Darwin, 501 f.  
 Dauphiny (dō'fi ni), 103  
 Dawes plan, 631  
 Debts, European, in United States, 644 f.  
 Declaration of Independence of American colonies, 48 f.  
 Declaration of Rights of Man, 128, 201  
 Decrès, 178 n.  
 de Lesseps (dè le seps'), 377  
 Delhi (del'e), 40  
 Democracy, 3, 62, 71, 148, 167, 216, 351, 485  
*Democracy in America*, 254 n.  
 Den'mark, 21; king of, 218, 292 f.  
 Departments of France, 128, 160  
 Deputies, Chamber of (France), 331 f.  
 Despots, 7, 102, 140, 152, 178, 180, 258; "benevolent," 88 ff., 112  
 De Valera, 620  
 Development, modern theories of, 501 ff.  
*Dictionary, Universal*, 78  
 Diderot (dēd rō'), Denis, 78 ff., 91, 111  
 Diet, German, 163  
 Dijon (dē zhōn'), 161  
 Directory, 149 f., 152, 157 f., 165  
 Disarmament, projects for, 638 f.  
 Disraeli (diz rā'li), 351 f.  
 Dissenters, English, 66 ff., 93, 96, 360  
 Divine right of kings, 5, 93, 96, 248, 290  
 Dred Scott decision, 304  
 Dresden, 187  
 Duma (dō'mä), Russian, 424 f.  
 Dumouriez (dü mö ryā'), 141 f.  
 Dun'kirk, 146  
 Dupleix (dü pleks'), 42 f.

- Duquesne (dù kân'), Fort, 42  
 Dutch, 39, 41, 44
- East India Company, 41, 47, 389  
 Eastern question, 428; the Near, 532 f.  
 Ebert (ä'bert), 587, 604, 613  
 Ebro (ë'brö) River, 179  
 Economic developments, 165, 177, 205, 216, 218, 221, 249 f., 258, 438 f., 445, 449, 467, 471, 481, 487, 495.  
*See* Blockades, Industrial Revolution, Secularization, Slaves, Socialism, Voting, Wealth
- Economists, 114 f.  
 Ecuador (ek'wa dôr), 224  
 Education, 208; in Russia, 91 f.; in France, 105, 150, 177, 208, 258, 335; in Germany, 186; in Prussia, 208; in Austria, 262, 302; in Italy, 284; in England, 360
- Edward I, 94  
 Egypt, Napoleon's campaign, 157; French claims withdrawn, 341; under the Sultan of Turkey, 461; independent, 551, 627
- Eisenach (i'zen äk), 314  
 Elbe (el'be), 188, 199  
 Electricity, 510 f.  
 Electrons, 508  
 Elizabeth, Queen, 65, 368  
 Emigrant nobles (*émigrés*), 134 ff., 137 ff.; return of, 166
- Emigration, 285  
*Émile* (ä mël'), by Rousseau, 81
- Empire, German, 164, 295, 307 ff., 485, 589; first French, 167 ff.; second French, 256 ff.; Austro-Hungarian, 301; British (*see* England). *See* Austria, Holy Roman Empire, Imperialism, Napoleon I, Russia, Spain
- Ems, 300  
*Encyclopaedia*, 78 ff., 91, 111  
 Engels (eng'els), Frederick, 246 n.
- England, colonies and commerce of, 37 ff., 199 ff., 397 f., 458; and Scotland, 93 f.; and Spain, 93, 169, 224, 227; and France, 157, 162, 169 f., 175, 179; and Holland, 169; and Austria, 198; in the World War, 542 f.; after World War, 618 ff.
- Entente Cordiale*, the (än tänt' kordyäl'), 529 ff.  
 Estates General, 6, 118 f.
- Es thö'ni a, 21, 551, 592, 602  
 Eupen (oi'pen), 591  
 Europe, relative area of, 38  
 European colonial dominion, extent of, 38  
 "Evolution," theory of, 502  
 Execution, of Louis XVI, 141; of Marie Antoinette, 146
- Factory legislation, England, 362 ff.  
 Fascism, 614 ff.  
 "Fä shö'dä incident," 340  
 Federal Council, German. *See* Bundesrat
- Fë'ni ans, 372  
 Ferdinand I of Austria, 33, 262  
 Ferdinand of Naples, 226  
 Ferdinand VII of Spain, 221  
 Feudalism, 59, 105, 108, 126, 180, 184, 221 f., 262, 442. *See* Serfdom
- Fichte (fik'te), 186  
 Finance, 115 f., 119, 131, 150 n., 165, 176, 265, 283; in France, 9, 114 ff., 119, 131, 150 n.; in Italy, 265, 283
- Fin'land, 183, 419 f., 571, 592  
 "First International," 497
- Fiume, 625  
 Flemish language, 194  
 Florence, 56, 268, 281  
 Florida, 49  
 Foch (fösh), 581  
 Fourier (fö ryä'), 250  
 Fourteen Points, the, 578  
 Fox, George, 66  
 France, 38, 102, 108; and Austria, 26 f., 95, 113, 138, 142, 154, 161, 187; and England, 28, 39, 95, 116, 141, 153, 162, 169, 174; colonies and commerce, 37 ff., 40 ff., 339 ff.; and America, 48 f., 112, 116, 254 n., 296 n.; old provinces, 103 f., 128; and India, 112; and Prussia, 138, 141, 153, 172, 297; and South America, 377; First Republic, 139 ff.; and Spain, 153, 226; and Italy, 154, 161; and Turkey, 161; dependencies, 164, 458; and Holland, 164 (*see* Napoleon); relations of, with other powers, 161 ff.; Second Republic, 251 ff.; Third Republic (1870- ), 324 ff.; Commune, 326 f.; constitution of, 329 ff.; separation of Church and State, 332; Associations Law, 335; in twentieth

- century, 492 ff.; socialism in, 496; in World War, 540 ff.; government and social development (*see* Revolution). *See* Bourbons, Napoleon I
- Franche-Comté (frōnsh-kōn tā'), 11
- Francis Ferdinand, murder of, 540
- Francis I, emperor, 26 n., 182, 204
- Francis II, emperor of Austria, 26 n.
- Francis Joseph, emperor of Austria, 268 f.
- Franco-Prussian War, 295 f.
- Franco-Russian Alliance, 520
- Frankfurt (frangk'furt), 219, 267, 269, 295, 326
- Franklin, Benjamin, 48
- Frederick I of Prussia, 2, 25
- Frederick II (the Great), 22, 25 ff., 88, 90 n., 95, 185
- Frederick William (the Great Elector), 23 ff.
- Frederick William III, 172 f., 184, 203
- Frederick William IV, 267, 270, 289
- Free trade, 85, 365 f.
- Freising (fri'zing), 164
- French, Sir J., 555
- French and Indian War, 42
- French language, 194 n.
- Friedland (frēd'lānt), 173
- Friend of the People*, 137
- Friends, Society of, 66
- Fulton, Robert, 375 f.
- Galicja (ga lish'i a), 302, 551; king of, 171
- Gal i lē'ō, 73, 74
- Gallipoli (gāl lēp'ō lē), 551
- Gam bet'ta, 324
- Gandhi, (gān'dē) Mahatma, 646
- Garibaldi, Giuseppe (gä rē bäl'dē, jö sep'pe), 278
- Gasoline Engine, 511 f.
- General Workingmen's Association, 314
- Geneva (je nē'va), 65, 77, 196; Protocol, 639
- Genghis Khan (jen'giz kän), 18
- Genoa (jen'ō a), 56, 103, 161, 193, 196, 199, 278
- George I, 94, 96
- George II, 94, 96
- George III, 46 f., 94, 97, 172
- Georgia, 67
- Germ theory of disease, 511 f.
- German East Africa, 552
- German Empire, 164, 295 ff.; German emperor, 300 (*see* Kaiser); constitution of, 307; Bundesrat, 310; Reichstag, 310; powers of chancellor, 311; powers of imperial government, imperial legislation, 311 f.; State socialism, Bismarck's attitude, 314; social legislation, accident and sickness insurance and old-age pensions, 316 f.; adoption of protective tariff policy, 317; colonial expansion in Africa, 318 f.; reign of William II, 320 ff., 575; colonial policy in Asia, 320 f.; dissatisfaction of Socialists, 321 f.; world power, 485 ff.; industrial prosperity, 487; foreign trade, 488 f.; socialism in, 496; enters World War, 540 f.; loss of colonies, 552, 591 f., 597; peace proposal, 560; collapse, 586 f.; reparations, 596 f., 630 ff.; postwar dissatisfaction, 640 f.
- German language, 89, 91, 186, 293
- German literature, 207
- German Republic, 609
- Germans, 204, 261, 292, 302
- Germany, invasion, 141, 153; national degradation and redistribution of territory, 162 ff., 182; loose federation, 195; ascendancy of Prussia, 217; confederation of (1815-1866), 218 f.; signs of progress, 221; National Assembly, 267 f.; impossibility of including Austria and Prussia in a German union, 269 f.; Prussian constitution of 1849, 271; Industrial Revolution, 288; policy of William I and Bismarck to expel Austria from the confederation, 289; dissolution of the confederation, 293; War of 1866, 293; the North German Federation, 294; Franco-Prussian War, 295 ff.; cession of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany, 298. *See* Austria, German Empire, Holy Roman Empire
- Ghent (gent), 216
- Gibraltar, 15, 43, 200
- Girondists (ji ron'dists), 143 f.
- Gladstone (glad'stun), 350 ff., 372
- Goethe (gē'te), 207
- Gordon, General, 463 f.
- Gotha (gō'tä), general labor congress at, 314

- Government, new theories about, 241;  
types in nations, 606 f.
- Grand Alliance, 14
- Great Britain. *See* England
- Greece, 428 f., 555, 565, 626, 628
- Greeks, 38; War of Independence,  
428 ff.
- Grévy (grā vē'), president of France,  
331
- Grey, Sir Edward, 542
- Grotius (grō'shi us), 15
- Guilds, 54 ff., 243 n.
- Guillotín (gē yō tañ'), Dr., 146 n.
- Guillotine (gil'o tēn), 146
- Guinea (gīn'ī), French, 339
- Guizot (gē zō'), 250 f.
- Haakon (hō'kon) VII, 197
- Hā'be as Cor'pus Act, 83
- Hague conferences, 522 f., 573, 637
- Hague Tribunal and World Court,  
637 f.
- Ham'burg, 38, 164, 182, 295
- Han'ni bal, 162
- Han'o ver, 293; house of, 94; elec-  
tors of, 94, 169; city of, 169, 172 f.
- Han o vē'ri an line, 146
- Hapsburgs (haps'bérġs), 26, 28, 33 f.,  
182, 261, 268
- Hardenberg (här'den berk), Prince,  
184
- Hargreaves (här'grēvs), James, 232
- Hébert (ā bér'), 147
- Hejaz, 589, 595, 627
- Henry II of England, 368
- Henry VII of England, 65
- Henry IV of France, 4, 226
- Henry V of France, 214, 248
- Henry, Patrick, 46
- Herzegovina (hért se gō vē'nä). *See*  
Bosnia
- Hesse (hes), 221, 295, 299
- Hesse-Cassel (hes-kās'el), 293 f.
- Hindenburg, 551, 613 f.
- Hin du stän', 40, 42
- History, defined, 1 f.; modern, 207;  
importance of recent, 512 ff.; sci-  
entific, 513; critical use of sources,  
514
- Hö'gärth, 98
- Hohenzollerns (hō en tsol'erns), 3, 22,  
33, 271, 290 f., 295, 300
- Holland, 11, 37 f., 65, 153, 163 f., 167,  
169, 188, 193 f., 199; king of, 171,  
255, 296; annexation to France, 182
- Holstein (hōl'shtīn), 218
- Holy Alliance, 2, 202 f., 228
- Holy Roman Empire, 17, 26, 94, 142,  
195, 199, 218, 299 n.
- Horthy, Admiral, 624
- Hospitals, 91, 432
- House of Commons, 49, 94, 97 f.
- House of Lords, 61, 94, 97, 357
- Hudson Bay, 39
- Hugo, Victor, 206 n.
- Huguenots (hū'ge nots), 4, 11, 89
- Humanists, 205
- Hum'bert I, king of Italy, 284
- Humboldt, Karl Wilhelm, 208
- "Hundred Days," the, 189
- Hungarians, 91, 204, 261. *See* Austria-  
Hungary
- Hungary, 34 f., 182, 262 ff., 302 f.;  
king of, 171; revolution in, 265 ff.;  
kingdom of (after 1866), 301; after  
World War, 624 f.
- Imperialism, in German Empire, 318 f.;  
in France, 339 ff.; missionaries as  
agents of, 380 f.; in Near-Eastern  
question, 526 f.
- Index of prohibited books, 176
- India, 37 ff., 43, 112, 157, 200, 384 ff.,  
389, 646 f.
- Industrial Revolution, 230 ff.; in Eng-  
land, 232 f., 362; in France, 236; in  
German Empire, 288, 314; in Rus-  
sia, 416; in Japan, 444. *See*  
Socialism
- Industry, demoralized after World  
War, 602
- Inquisition, 65, 180, 221
- Insurance, State or national, in German  
Empire, 316 f.; in England, 480 f.
- Interest, 84 n.
- International agreements, 573 f.
- International Workingmen's Associ-  
ation. *See* First International
- "Interpellations," 339
- Intolerance, 63, 68, 222
- Invalides, church of, 190
- Inventions, 230 ff., 379 f.
- I ō'ni an Islands, 199
- Irish question, 367 ff., 483 f., 620 f.;  
land acts, 371; home rule in Ire-  
land, 371 f., 483 f. *See* Catholics,  
Church, "Orangemen"
- Isabella, Queen, 296



- Is'tri a, 302  
 Italians, 91, 152, 204, 302  
 Italy, 51, 56, 157; king of, 154 n., 170;  
 and France, 158, 161, 167, 193 f.,  
 276 f.; and Spain, 162; republic of,  
 164, 266; and Austria, 195, 199,  
 222, 225, 266; unification of, 273 ff.;  
 kingdom since 1861, 279 ff.; and  
 Prussia, 280; colonies, 283, 286;  
 and Turkey, 534 f.; in World War,  
 552; Fascism in, 614 ff.; postwar  
 conditions, 641. *See* Napoleon I  
  
 Jac'o bins, 137, 145, 147 ff., 149, 210  
 James I, 72, 94, 368  
 James II, 93 ff., 96, 368  
 Jameson raid, 400  
 Jamestown, 39  
 Japan, a world power, 439 ff.; war  
 with China, 445 ff.; in World War,  
 543; modernization of, 649 f.  
 Jā'va, 39  
 Jefferson, President, 175  
 Jena (yā'nā), 172, 184  
 Jen'ner, Edward, 503  
 Jerusalem captured, 551  
 Jes'uits, 65 f., 89, 212, 221, 334  
 Jews in Russia, 421 f.  
 Joff're, 541, 547, 556  
 John VI, king of Portugal, 227  
 Joliet (zhō lyā' or jō'li et), 39  
 Joseph II of Austria, 26, 33, 35, 88, 113  
 Josephine, 166, 181  
*Journal des Savants* (zhör nāl' dā sā-  
 vān'), 10  
 Jugoslavia (yōō'gōslā'vīa), 593, 602, 625  
 July ordinances, 213  
 Junkers, 185, 290, 308  
  
 Kaiser, powers of, 310, 575 f.  
 Karolyi (kā'rō yi), Count, 603  
 Kellogg Treaty, 639  
 Kemal, Mustapha (mōōs'tā fā kē māl'),  
 594  
 Kerensky, 570  
 Kiaochow (kyou chō'), 321, 552  
 Kiel (kēl) Canal, 293  
 Kleber (klā bē'), 145  
 Koch (kok), 505  
 Korea, 445, 451, 452  
 Kosciusko (kos i us'kō), 32  
 Kossuth (kosh'ūt), 264, 268  
 Kotzebue (kot'se bō), 219  
 Krü'ger, President, 400, 486  
  
 Labor legislation, summary view, 364  
 Lafayette (lä fā yet'), Marquis of,  
 48 f., 123, 130, 214, 254 n.  
 Laibach (lī'bāk), 225  
*Laissez faire* (le'sā fēr'), 85, 242 n.  
 Lamarck, 502  
 Languedoc (län'ge dok'), 103  
 Laodomenia, king of, 171  
 Laos (lä'ōz), 341  
 La Salle (lä sāl'), 39  
 Lassalle (lä sāl'), 314  
 Lat'er an, 282  
 Latin peoples, 296  
 Lat'via, 592, 602  
 Lausanne (lō zān'), Treaty of, 594 f.  
 Laws, 88, 92, 104, 110, 128 f., 150, 166,  
 201, 213, 217, 335; cruel, 82 f., 91,  
 97, 102, 264, 361  
 League of Nations, 2, 597 ff., 635 ff.  
 Ledru-Rollin (le drü'ro lan'), 255  
 Leeds, 37, 345  
 Legislative Assembly, France, 135,  
 137, 143  
 "Legislator," Diderot's, 80  
 Leipzig (līp'sik), 80, 314; battle of,  
 187, 219; Labor congress (1863),  
 314  
 Lenin (lye'nēn), 570  
 Leopold I, Emperor, 11, 13  
 Leopold II of Austria, 26, 134, 136  
 Leopold I, king of Belgium, 217  
 Leopold II, king of Belgium, 217 n.  
 Leopold, prince of Hohenzollern, 296  
 Letter writers, 56  
*Letters on the English*, Voltaire's, 76  
*Lettres de cachet* (let'r de kā shē'), 109,  
 125  
 Leuthen (loi'ten), 28  
 Lexington, 47  
 Liaotung (le ou tung') peninsula, 320  
 Liberation, War of, 187, 190  
 Li bē'ri a, 566  
 Liège (lē ezh'), 546  
 Li Hung Chang (lē'hōng'chāng'), 450  
 Lille (lēl), 236  
 Lima (lē'mā), 80  
 Lincoln, Abraham, 304  
 Lisbon, 80  
 Lister, 504 f.  
 Literature, 205 ff.  
 Lithuania (lith u ā'ni a), 592, 602  
 Little Entente, 632  
 Liverpool, 38  
 Livingstone, 457 f.

- Li vō'ni a, 21, 551  
 Lloyd George, 476 f., 481, 589, 618  
 Locarno Conference, 632 f.  
 Locke, John, 76  
 Lombardo-Venetian, 196, 222, 262, 265  
 Lom'bar dy, 162, 277  
 London, 53 f., 56, 67  
 Lorraine (lo rān'), 103; duke of, 171.  
     *See* Alsace  
 Louis XIV, 4 ff., 39, 45, 88, 102, 106, 109, 112, 299 n.  
 Louis XV, 15, 20, 80, 103, 112, 181  
 Louis XVI, 48, 103, 109, 112 f., 119, 131, 135 f., 138, 141, 210  
 Louis XVII, 194 n.  
 Louis XVIII, 188 f., 194, 198, 210, 212, 226  
 Louis Napoleon, 255 f.  
 Louis Philippe, 213 f., 248 ff., 258, 328  
 Louisiana, 39, 49, 162, 167, 304  
 Louvain (lō vañ'), 548  
 Lü'beck, 164, 182, 295  
 Lucerne (lō sērñ'), 261  
 Lunéville (lū nā vēl'), Treaty of, 163  
*Lusitania* (lō si tā'ni a), the, 490, 554  
 Luxembourg Palace, 252  
 Luxembourg (luk'sem bērg), 217 f., 296, 542  
 Lyell (lī'ell), 501  
 Lyon (lē ōñ'), 145, 147, 149, 236  
  
 Macdonald, Ramsay, 619 f.  
 MacMahon (māk mā ōñ'), 327 ff.  
 Mad a gas'car, 340  
 Ma drās', 40, 43  
 Madrid, 179 f., 225  
 Magyars (mod'yors), 261 f.  
 Mä hōn', Port, 43  
 Mahratta (ma rat'a) Confederacy, 385 f.  
 Mainz (mīnts), 141  
 Malmedy (mäl'me dē), 591  
 Malta, 199  
 Manchester, 37, 345  
 Mandates, 597  
 Man'tū à, 154  
 Marat (mā rā'), 137  
 Marchand (mār shāñ'), Major, 340  
 Marconi (mār kō'nē), 380  
 Ma ren'go, battle of, 162  
 Maria Louisa, 181, 195, 223  
 Maria Theresa (ma rī'a te rē'sa), 26, 34, 90 n., 91, 95, 112, 114  
  
 Marie Antoinette (mā rē'än twā net'), 112, 114, 146, 181  
 Marlborough, duke of, 14  
 Marne, battle of, 547  
 Marquette (mār ket'), 39  
 "Marseillaise" (mār se lāz'), 101  
 Marseille (mār sā'y'), 145, 236  
 Marx, Karl, 245, 314, 338, 422  
 Maryland, 39, 66 n.  
 Masaryk (mä'sā rēk), Thomas, 593  
 Massachusetts, 44, 47  
 Massacres. *See* Atrocities  
 Mather, Cotton, 76  
 Mauritius (mō rish'ius), 199 n.  
 Maximilian, archduke, of Austria, 296 n.  
 Mazarin (mä zä rañ'), Cardinal, 4 f., 11  
 Mazzini (mät sē'nē), 274, 278  
 Mecklenburg (mek'len bērg), 293  
 Med'i ter ra'ne an, 157, 199  
 Mercantilists, 85  
 Mesopotamia, 584, 595, 627  
 Metric system of weights and measures, 150  
 Metternich (met'er nik), Prince, 181, 203, 219, 225, 227, 260, 265  
 Metz, 299 n., 324 f., 546, 583  
 Meuse (mēz), 546  
 Mexico, 38, 223, 227, 296, 304, 467 f.  
 Michael, Grand Duke, 569  
 Mi lan', 56, 154, 162, 196, 266; decree of, 174  
 Militarism, Prussian, 24, 185, 218, 289, 307, 490, 569, 574, 576; Italian, 283; French, 328 f.; in the twentieth century, 539  
 Millerand (mēl rāñ'), 338  
 Milton, John, 76  
 "Ministerial responsibility," 312  
 Mi nōr'ca, 43  
 Mirabeau (mē rā bō'), 124  
 Missions, 66, 381 ff., 441, 457  
 Mississippi River, 39  
 Missouri Compromise, 304  
 Modena (mō'dā nā), 154, 195, 222 f., 273, 277; Mary of, 94  
 Mō gul', Great, 40 f.  
 Mohammedans, 33 f., 42, 455 f.  
 Molecular theory, 507 f.  
 Molière (mō lyēr'), 9  
 Monasteries, 63, 91 f., 131, 180, 221 f., 261 n.  
 Mongols, 18 f., 40 f., 262 n., 303

- Moniteur* (mō nē tēr'), 137  
 Monroe Doctrine, 226, 296 n.  
 Montesquieu (mōn tes kē ē'), 80, 83;  
     *Spirit of Laws*, 80  
 Montreal, 39  
 Mo rā'vi a, 92, 261, 269, 301; Margrave  
     of, 171  
 Moresnet (mō'rā ne'), 591  
 Morley, John, 80  
 Morocco, 341, 461 f., 531  
 Moscow (mos'kou), 183, 571  
 "Mountain," the, 143 f.  
 Murat (mū rā'), 171, 179, 184  
 Mussolini (mūs'sō lī'ni), 614 ff.  
  
 Namur (nā mūr'), 546  
 Nantes (nants), revocation of Edict of,  
     12, 64, 147 f.  
 Naples, 195, 222, 266, 279; and  
     France, 136, 161; king of, 171, 179,  
     223, 226, 273, 278  
 Napoleon I, 150, 197; and the Papal  
     States, 154, 182, 193, 195; in Italy,  
     170, 182, 195; and Prussia, 172, 184,  
     187; in Poland, 173; in Russia, 173,  
     183, 187; and Spain, 179 f., 188;  
     and Holland, 182, 188; and Austria,  
     187; abdication of, 188  
 Napoleon II, 181  
 Napoleon III, 257, 276 f., 279 f., 295,  
     305, 324  
 Napoleonic House, 255  
*Napoleonic Ideas*, 255  
 Nassau (nā'sou), duke of, 217 n., 294  
 National Assembly, 101, 123 ff., 135,  
     325 ff.  
 "National guard," 125 f.  
 National spirit, 178; in Germany, 186,  
     207, 218; in Italy, 223, 265  
 Nationalism, 3 f., 198 f., 201, 260  
 Nations, interdependence of, 573  
 Navigation, 375 f.  
 Navigation laws, 44 f., 86  
 Necker, 115 f., 120, 125  
 Neerwinden (nār vin'den), battle of,  
     142  
 Nelson, General, 157, 173  
 Netherlands, 38, 194, 218; Spanish,  
     11, 103; Austrian, 14, 139, 141 f.,  
     153 f., 164, 194, 199, 215; Dutch,  
     215  
 Neutral nations, 176, 301, 566  
 New Cal e dō'ni a, 328  
 Newcomen (nū kum'en), 236  
 Newfoundland, 39  
 New Gra nā'da, 224  
 New Lan'ark, 234  
 New Orleans, 39  
 Newspapers, 136 f., 167, 175, 201, 208,  
     251, 254, 258, 264, 291, 297, 357,  
     457, 514 f.  
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 76, 93  
 New Zealand, 396  
 Niagara, Fort, 42  
 Nice (nēs), 277  
 Nicholas I, 408 f.  
 Nicholas II, 418 f., 569 f.  
 Nightingale, Florence, 432  
 Nihilism, 414  
 Nile, battle of, 158, 457  
 Nobility, decline of, 58 f.; French,  
     59 f., 106, 120, 123 f., 136; English,  
     60 f.; German, 61, 92; new French,  
     167, 178; Hungarian and Austrian,  
     262  
 North America, 39, 286  
 Northmen, 18  
 Norway, 196 f.  
 Notables, 118  
 Notre Dame (nō'tr dām), 147, 167  
 Nō vā'rā, 268, 273  
 Nova Scotia, 39, 43  
 Nov'go rod, 18  
 Noyon (nōw yōn'), 566  
  
 O'Connell, 372  
 Ohio valley, 42, 46  
 Old régime, 102, 116, 121  
 "Opium War" (1840), 438  
 Orange, House of, 194  
 Orange, William of, 11, 14, 95, 215  
 Orange Free State, 398 f.  
 "Orangemen," 368  
*Organization of Labor*, 250  
 Orinoco, 199 n.  
 Orlando, 589  
 Orleanists, 325, 329  
 Orleans (ōr'lā ān'), 102, 213  
 Oscar II, 197  
 Os tend', 548  
 Oth'män, 33  
 O tran'to, 169  
 Otto the Great, 291  
 Owen, Robert, 234, 244 f., 250, 363  
 Oxford, 67  
  
 Pa lat'i nate, Rhenish, 13  
 Palestine, 584, 595, 627

- Pän'a mä', 565  
 Panama Canal, 377, 466  
 Pan-Germanism, 539  
 Pan-Slavism, 539  
 Papal possessions, 154, 182, 193, 195, 222 f., 279, 281  
 Paraguay (par'a gwä), 286  
 Paris, 54 f., 102, 134, 135 f., 136 f., 139 f., 143 f., 146 f., 157, 177, 188, 213, 252, 258; mob of, 129; Treaty of (1814), 194; second Treaty of (1815), 194; siege of (1870-1871), 324 f.; Treaty of (1856), 432; Peace Conference (1919), 589 ff.; Pact of, 639  
 Paris, Count of, 251, 328 f.  
 Parlements, 109, 119 f.  
 Parliament, English, 93 ff.; and king, 96 f., 344; Prussian, and Bismarck, 291; Austrian and Hungarian, 301; French, 331  
 Parma, 195, 222 f., 273, 277  
 Parnell, 370 f.  
 Pasteur (päs tēr'), 505  
 Peace proposals, 560; "Plan for Lasting Peace," 2; general peace of 1802, 162  
 Peasants, 52, 59, 92, 126, 303, 604 f.  
 Pē'drō, 227  
 Peel, Robert, 366  
 Peerage, 61  
 Peninsular War, 180, 190  
 Penn, William, 66  
 Pennsylvania, 39, 66  
 Penny post, 379  
 Permanent Court of International Justice, 637 f.; United States and, 645  
 Perry, Commodore, 442  
 Persecutions, 68, 165; of Catholics, 66; of Protestants, 66  
 Persh'ing, General, 582  
 Peru, 224  
 Pesth (pest), 264, 303  
 Peter I (the Great), 19 ff., 89, 113  
 Peter II, 90 n.  
 Peter III, 90  
 Petrograd (pyë trō grät'), 21  
 Philadelphia, 47, 66  
 Philip V of Spain, 13 f.  
 Piedmont, 154 n., 164, 193, 222, 266, 275  
 Pillnitz, Declaration of, 136  
 Pitt the Elder (Lord Chatham), 37, 42, 346  
 Pitt the Younger, 98, 346  
 Plassey (pläs'e), 43  
 Plebiscite, 160, 256, 592  
 Plehve (plä'vè), 420  
 Poland, 21, 29 ff., 51, 141, 153, 173, 182, 197 f., 199, 261; first partition, 30; second partition, 32; third and final partition, 32; Poles, 261; rebellion in, 408 f.; in World War, 551; Republic of, 593, 602  
 Political economy, 83 ff., 241 f., 362  
 Political parties, 201, 260, 268; Whigs, 46, 96 f.; in England, 46, 96, 261, 346, 472, 618 f.; in France, 135, 137, 143 f., 147, 161, 211 ff., 226, 248 ff., 325 f., 328, 337 f.; in Germany, 219, 267, 290, 296, 308 f., 313; in Spain, 221, 223, 225; in Switzerland, 261; in Hungary, 264; in Italy, 269, 274, 284; Social Democrats, 309; Catholic party, 313; "State socialists," 314 f.; Legitimists, 328 f.; "Possibilist" party (France), 338; Tory party, 346; Labor party (English), 472, 618 f. *See* Bonapartists, Girondists, Jacobins  
 Polo, Marco, 441  
 Pondicherry (pon di sher'i), 41 f.  
 Pope, the, 165, 179, 222, 273, 278 f., 282, 302; Pius IX, 266, 280 f., 334; Pius X, 286; Leo XIII, 334  
 Port Arthur, 423, 447, 451  
 Porte, the, 158, 432  
 Portsmouth, Treaty of, 452  
 Portugal, 37 f., 49, 169, 179, 227  
 Portuguese, 39, 41  
 Potsdam, 89  
 Poverty, war of English government against, 471 ff. *See* Social legislation  
 Prague, 266, 268  
 Prayer, Book of Common, 65  
 Prefects, 160  
 Press, censorship of, 64 f., 102, 110, 167, 211, 213, 220 ff., 258, 262, 264; freedom of, 68, 93, 98, 129, 136 f., 211, 215, 265, 296, 331, 357 f.  
 Pressburg, Treaty of, 170, 265  
 Pretenders, 94 f., 96  
 Prime minister, 96  
 Primo de Rivera, 618  
 "Prince Charlie," 95, 97  
 Prison reform, 361  
 Privileges and monopolies, 59 f., 91, 104, 106, 126  
 Proportional Representation, 607



- Protestants, in France, 64; in Prussia and northern Europe, 65, 89; in England, 93; in Netherlands, 216; in Switzerland, 261 n.
- Provence (pro väns'), 103; count of, 194
- Prussia, Great Elector of Brandenburg (1640-1688), 23 f.; Frederick the Great, 25 ff.; War of the Austrian Succession, 26 f.; Seven Years' War, 27, 42; and Poland, 29 ff.; Basel, Treaty of, 153; Napoleonic reconstruction of Germany, 163; war with France (1806), 172; Jena, 184; gains (1815), 198; king of, 270, 271, 289, 290, 292, 293, 294, 299; nineteenth-century constitution of, 217, 308
- Public trials advocated, 83
- Pun jäb', 386
- Puritans, 39
- Pyramids, battle of, 157
- Quakers, 39, 66, 76
- Que bec', 39, 42
- Queen Anne's War, 2, 14
- Races, 261, 296 n., 302 ff.
- Racine (rà sën'), 9
- Radium, 507
- Railways, 314, 377 f., 417, 448, 539
- Rasputin (ràs pü'tën), 569
- Red Cross, 432
- Reform, spirit of, 97 f., 101, 267
- Reforms, of Colbert in France, 9; of Peter in Russia, 10; of Turgot in France, 113; of Calonne in France, 118 f.; of National Assembly (1789), 125 f., 133; of National Convention, 150; of Bonaparte, 165 f.; of Napoleon in Spain, 180; of Kossuth in Hungary, 265; in England, 344 ff. *See* Social legislation
- Reichsdeputationshauptschluss* (rīks-dā pö tät si öns haupt'shlūs), 195
- Reichstadt (rīk'shtät), duke of, 212. *See* Napoleon II
- Reichstag (rīks'täk), 310
- Reign of Terror, 102, 126, 133, 142 f.
- Reims (rēmz, *Fr.* ràns), 547, 582
- Reparations, German, 596 f., 630 ff.
- Republic, First French, 139 f.; Cisalpine, 154; Batavian, 164; Ligurian, 169 f.; Second French, 251 f.; Third French, 324 ff.; Czechoslovak, 593; German, 609. *See* France, Genoa, Italy, Venice
- Revolution, Poland (1794), 32; England (1688), 93; France (1789), 118 ff., 133 ff.; France (1830), 212 ff.; Belgium (1830), 215 ff.; Italy (1820), 225; Spain (1820), 225; France (1848), 248 ff.; Austria (1848), 260 ff.; Germany (1848), 260 ff.; Bohemia (1848), 261 ff.; Italy (1848), 266; Poland (1830), 408 f.; China (1911), 451 f.; Turkey (1908), 533 f.; Russia (1917), 568 f. *See* Industrial Revolution, Republic
- Revolution, of 1830, 213 f., 215; of 1848, 248 ff., 260 ff.
- Revolutionary influences, 49, 71, 105, 110 f., 115 f., 141 f., 218, 223 f., 225, 227 f., 251, 260 ff., 496
- Revolutionary Tribunal, 146
- Revolutionary wars, 138 f., 141 f., 153
- Revolutions of 1848, general failure, 268 ff.
- Rhine, 141, 153, 163 f., 198, 217, 291; Confederation of the, 171, 182, 188, 193, 195
- Rhode Island, 49
- Richelieu (rësh lyè'), Cardinal, 4 f., 10
- Robespierre (rō bes pyèr'), 147
- Romagna (rō män'yä), 277
- Roman Empire, 131
- Romans, 38
- Romanticism, 206
- Rome, 56, 266, 268, 279, 281 f.; King of, 181 f., 212
- Roosevelt, T., 377, 452
- Rossbach (ros'bäk), 128
- "Rotten boroughs," 347 f.
- Roumania. *See* Rumania
- Roundheads, 96
- Rousseau (rö sö'), Jean Jacques, 80 f., 91, 206
- Royal Society, 93
- Ruhr valley, 630
- Rumania, 303, 434, 558, 594, 626
- Rumanians, 35, 262
- Rumford, Count, 208
- Rurik (rö'rik), 18
- Russell, Lord John, 347

- Russia, 17 ff., 51, 89 ff., 406 ff.; and France, 136, 161, 169, 183, 187; and Poland, 197 f.; and Turkey, 228; in World War, 542, 558, 571, 583; after the World War, 595, 612 f., 641 f. *See* Church, Greeks
- Russian Constitution, 610 f.
- Russian revolution (1917), 568 ff.
- Russian serfdom, 411 ff.
- Russian socialism, 568
- Russo-Japanese War, 423 f., 451 f.
- Russo-Turkish War (1877), 434
- Ruthenians, 302
- Saar (sär), 596
- Sadowa (sä'dō vä), 280, 293, 301
- St. Bernard Pass, Great, 162
- St. Dié, 548
- Saint-Germain-en-Laye (san'zher'-man'än lä'), Treaty of, 592
- St. He lē'na, 190
- St. Louis, 88
- St. Mihiel (san mē'yel'), 583
- St. Petersburg, 21
- St. Pierre (san pyēr'), Abbé de, 2
- St. Quentin (san kōn tan'), 583
- Salem (Mass.), witchcraft in, 76
- Salzburg, duke of, 171
- Saratoga, 48
- Sar din'ī a, 223, 274, 275 f., 277; and France, 136, 153 f.; king of, 154, 195 f., 199, 222, 266, 280
- Savona, 153
- Savoy, 141, 154 n., 194, 277; Eugene of, 14
- Saxony, 217, 267, 294; king of, 173, 187, 197 f.
- Schleswig-Holstein (shlāz'vik-hōl'-shhtīn), 292, 293 n., 295, 592
- Schools. *See* Education
- Schwarzenberg (schvärt'sen berk), 268
- Science, 70 ff.; and religious beliefs, 74 ff.; metric system in, 150; in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, 500 ff.
- Scotland, 93 ff.
- Scott, Reginald, 76
- Scott, Sir Walter, 206
- Sea power, English, 521; German, 522
- Second International, 497 f.
- Secularization. *See* Church
- Sedan' (sè don'), 298, 324, 583
- Senate (France), 331 f.
- Senegal (sen e gól'), 339 ff.
- Sé'poys, 42 f., 388 f.
- Serbia, 35, 303, 429, 533, 538 f.
- Serfdom, 51 f., 91 f., 102, 126, 184, 262, 266, 411 ff.
- Se vas'tō pōl, 432
- Seven Years' War, 27 f., 40, 42 ff., 112, 162
- Sèvres, Treaty of, 594
- Shān tung', 446 f., 597
- Siam, 566
- Sicily, 278; king of, 171, 279
- Sigismund (si'jis mund, G. zē'gis-münt), Emperor, 22
- Silesia (si lē'shia), 26, 34
- Sindh (sind), 386
- Sinn Fein (shin fān), 373, 484; heads revolt, 620
- Six Acts, 347
- Slaves, 39, 200, 395
- Slavic peoples and lands, 18, 34 f., 217, 261, 269
- Sla vō'ni a, 301
- Slovaks, 261, 303
- Slovenes, 35, 302
- Smith, Adam, 85, 237, 241, 365; *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 85 f., 238
- Smuts, General, 403
- Smyrna, 627
- Social Contract, The*, 81 f.
- Social Democratic Federation (England), 472
- Social Democratic Labor party (German Empire), 314 f.
- Social Democrats, in German Empire, 309; in Russia, 422, 570
- Social legislation, 240, 251, 256; national insurance, 316, 480; local reforms, 363 f.; summary view, 364; Workmen's Compensation Act, 473; employment bureaus, 475
- Social orders, former, and struggles, 51 f., 61, 164, 201, 206, 335; in France, 58 ff., 99, 104, 107 f., 114, 118, 120, 126, 138, 143, 145, 164, 215; in England, 60 f., 97 f.; in Germany, 61, 218, 308; in Prussia, 184 f., 271; in Spain, 221; in Austria, 262; in Hungary, 263 f. *See* Bishops, Clergy, Nobility, Peasants, Serfdom, Third Estate

- Socialism, origin of word, 245; earlier phase, 245; Utopian, 245 n.; later phase, 245 f.; in France, 249, 337 f.; in Russia, 314 ff., 422, 568; in German Empire, 316, 491 f.; in Australasia, 396; in England, 472, 618; in the twentieth century, 496 ff.; as an international movement, 525 f. See Babeuf, Blanc, Engels, Fourier, Marx, Owen
- Socialists. See Political parties, Socialism
- Soissons, 581
- Somme (som), 557, 582 f.
- Sophia of Hanover, 94
- South African Union, 401
- South America, 38, 223
- Soviets, 570, 610
- Spain, loss of Franche-Comté, 11; colonies and other possessions, 13 ff., 38, 43, 49; War of Spanish Succession (1701-1713), 14; coalition and war against France (1793-1795), 136, 142; cession of Louisiana to France (1801), 162; comes to aid of France (1803), 169; Joseph Bonaparte made king (1808), 179; England and France in, 180, 188; slave trade, 200; restoration in, after 1815, 221 f.; revolution in colonies of (1810-1825), 223; revolution in (1820), 225; assistance of the Pope by, in the destruction of the Roman Republic, 273; demonstration of, against Mexico, 296 n.; expulsion of Isabella (1868), 296; Leopold of Hohenzollern candidate for throne (1869-1870), 296; Amadeus of Italy becomes king (1870) and abdicates, 297; republic (1873), 297 n.; accession of Alphonso XII (1875), 297 n.; constitution (1876) and reign of Alphonso XIII, 297 n.; influence of, in Morocco, 461; Spanish-American War (1898), loss of American colonies, and decline as colonial power, 464 ff.; possessions in Africa, 465; in the World War, 617 f.
- Spanish succession, 296; War of Spanish Succession, 13 f., 195
- Spanish-American War (1898), 464 ff.
- Speyer (spī'ér), 164
- Spice Islands, 39
- Spinning, 232
- Spirit of Laws*, Montesquieu's, 80
- Stamp Act, 46
- Stanley in Africa, 457 f.
- Steam, 235, 375 f.
- Stein (shtim), Baron vom, 184, 208
- Stephenson, George, 205, 377 f.
- Strasbourg (strás bōr'), 12, 102, 255, 299 n., 324
- Submarine warfare, 553 f., 563 ff.
- Sudan (sö dän'), 341
- Suez Canal, 376 f.
- Suffrage, reform of, in England, 351 f.
- Sü mä'tra, 39
- Supreme Council, 591
- Sweden, 11, 169, 196 f.
- Switzerland, 163 f., 194, 196, 261
- Syria, Napoleon's campaign in, 158; in the World War, 584, 595, 627
- Taille (tä'ye), 104, 109, 118
- Taj Mahal (täzh ma hä'l'), 41
- Talleyrand (tä le rä'n'), 198
- Tanks, 557
- Tariff, protective, in German Empire, 317
- Tartars. See Mongols
- Taxation, 46, 59, 61, 63, 80, 86, 92, 102, 104, 109, 112, 116, 118 f., 126, 129, 162, 165 n., 211, 285, 292
- Telegraph and telephone, wireless, 379 f.
- "Tennis-Court" oath, 123
- Texas, 304
- Thermidor (ter mē dōr'), 148 n.
- Thiers (tyér), 326 f.
- Third Estate, 107, 120, 123, 137
- "Third International," 611
- Thirty Years' War, 5, 94
- Thirty-Nine Articles, 65
- Ti con de rō'ga, Fort, 42
- Tilsit, Treaty of, 173, 183
- Tocqueville (tok vil', Fr. tók vël'), Alexis de, 254 n.
- Tō'gō land, 319, 552
- Toleration, Act of, 68, 71, 89, 92 f., 96, 211, 302, 336, 359 f.
- Tonkin (ton kēn'), 341
- Tories, 46, 48, 96 f., 346
- Toulon (tō lōh'), 157
- Toulouse (tō löz'), 236
- Tours (tör), 324
- Towns, 54 f.
- Trade, Europe in foreign, 375
- Trade laws, 45

- Tra fal'gär, 173 f.  
 Trans-Si bē'ri an railroad, 378  
 Transvaal (trans vāl'), 398 f.  
 Transylvania, 34; grand duke of, 171  
 Trent, 281, 284  
 Trieste (trē es'te), 38, 281, 284, 302, 558  
 Trinidad, 199 n.  
 Triple alliances, 11, 283, 319 f., 528  
 Trip'o li, 283  
 Trotz'ky, 570  
 Tsar, 1, 19, 169, 172, 268. *See* Russia  
 Tuileries (twēl rē'), Palace of, 130, 139, 166  
 Tunis, 283, 339 f.  
 Turgot (tür gō'), 113  
 Turin, 154, 196, 222, 281  
 Turkey, and France, 161 f.; and Greece, 226, 626 f.; and the Eastern question, 428 ff., 531 f.; and Italy, 534 f.; in the World War, 543, 551 f.; surrenders, 584; and south-eastern Europe, 594 f.  
 Turkish revolution (1908), 533 f.  
 Turks, 33 f., 157, 283  
 Tuscany, 195, 222 f., 266, 273, 277  
 Tyr'ol, 302
- Ukraine, independence of, 571  
 Ulm (ûlm), 170  
 Ulster, 368, 621  
 United States of America, 38, 71, 116, 162, 175, 286, 464 ff.; Civil War, 304; World War, 559 ff., 563 ff.; and the World Court, 645 f.  
 Ur, 261 n.  
 Uruguay (ö rö gwī'), 286  
 Utrecht (yö'trecht), Treaty of, 2, 14 f., 39, 198
- Varennes (vä ren'), flight of the royal family to, 134  
 Vasco da Gama, 38  
 Vatican, 281  
 Vendée (vān dā'), 145  
 Venetia, 277, 279 f.  
 Venezuela, 224  
 Venice, 56, 154, 193, 196, 199, 268; duke of, 171  
 Venizelos, 555  
 Verdun (vēr duñ'), 141, 548, 556  
 Verona, Congress of, 226  
 Versailles (vēr sālz', *Fr.* ver sä'y'), 8, 48, 101, 106 f., 113, 123, 129, 300, 326; Treaty of, 2, 589
- Victor Emmanuel I of Sardinia, 268, 279 ff.  
 Victor Emmanuel III, 284  
 Victoria, queen of England, 350 n.  
 Vienna, 55, 154, 170, 220, 265 f., 268, 302; Treaty of, 180; Congress of, 193 ff.  
 Virginia, 44  
 Voltaire, 27, 76, 80, 83, 89, 91, 111, 206  
 Voting, 98, 120, 160, 212 f., 215 f., 248, 251, 256, 260, 271, 284, 295, 297 n., 308, 344 f., 351 f., 481 f.
- Wagram (vä'gräm), battle of, 180  
 Walpole, Robert, prime minister, 45, 96  
 War of 1812, 2  
 Wars, chief causes of, 2 f.; of Napoleon, 161 ff., 172  
 Warsaw, 173, 182, 193, 197 f., 551  
 Wartburg (värt'bürk), 219  
 Washington, George, 47 f.  
 Washington Conference, 642 f.  
 Waterloo, 190  
 Watt, James, 235  
 Wealth, of Church, 63; of clergy, 105; of king, 109. *See* Finance  
 Weimar, duke of, 207  
 Wellington, Duke of, 180, 188, 349  
 Wesley, Charles, 67  
 Wesley, John, 67  
 West Indies, 43, 45, 200  
 Westphalia, kingdom of, 173, 193; Treaty of, 299 n.  
 Whig party, 46, 96 f., 347  
 Whitefield (hwit'fēld), 67  
 Whitney, Eli, 233  
 Wilhelmina, queen of Holland, 217 n.  
 William III, king of England, 2, 93 f., 368  
 William IV, king of England, 350 n.  
 William of Orange, 11, 14, 95. *See* William III, king of England  
 William II, king of Holland, 217 n.  
 William III, king of Holland, 217 n.  
 William I, king of Prussia, emperor of Germany, 22, 289  
 William II, king of Prussia, emperor of Germany, 22, 187, 320 ff., 486, 577, 586  
 Wilson, Woodrow, 2, 560 f., 589  
 Windischgrätz (vin'dish grets), General, 268  
 Windward Islands, 199 n.



- Witchcraft, 75 f.  
*Witch Hammer*, 75  
 Wolfe, General, 42  
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 95 n.  
 Woman suffrage in England, 353, 481 f.  
 Women and children in industry, 239 f., 362; after the World War, 605 f.  
*Wonders of the Invisible World*, by Mather, 76  
 Workmen's Compensation Act (1897), 473  
 World Court. *See* Permanent Court of International Justice.  
 World War, 2, 18, 35, 176, 300, 518 ff., 546 ff.; Eastern Front, 551 ff.; marine warfare, 553 ff.; aerial warfare, 558; submarine warfare, 563 ff.  
 Württemberg (vür'tem bĕrk), 170, 195, 221, 295, 299  
 Würzburg (vürts'bürk), 164, 267  
 Yorktown, 49  
 Ypres (ĕ'pr), 581  
 Yser River (ĕ zĕr'), 548  
 Yuan Shih-Kai (yü än'shĕ-kĭ') tries to make himself "Emperor of China," 453  
 Zambesi (zám bá'zĕ), 457  
 Zän zi bär', 319  
*Zollverein* (tsöl'fer in), 288  
 Zug (tsök), 261 n.



# Date Due

MAR 05 1997

|                        |  |             |  |
|------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| F. J. BATA             |  |             |  |
| OCT 21 1970            |  | MAR 07 1997 |  |
| LIBRARY                |  |             |  |
| <del>OCT 12 1976</del> |  |             |  |
| APR 2 1965             |  |             |  |
| APR 24 1990            |  |             |  |
| MAR 07 1992            |  |             |  |
| JAN 07 1992            |  |             |  |
| MAR 25 1992            |  |             |  |
| MAR 12 1992            |  |             |  |
|                        |  |             |  |
|                        |  |             |  |
|                        |  |             |  |

bd

CAT. NO. 23 233

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

250  
D 299 .R6 1927

Robinson, James Harvey, 1

010101 000

History of Europe, our own tim



0 1163 0216949 9

TRENT UNIVERSITY

D299 .R6 1927

Robinson, James Harvey  
History of Europe

| DATE | ISSUED TO 147285 |
|------|------------------|
|      |                  |
|      |                  |
|      |                  |

147285



